

---

Volume XXVIII

JUNE 1942

Number 3

---

Bulletin  
of  
The American Association  
of  
University Professors

*Editor*

Ralph E. Himstead

*Editorial Committee*

Thomas F. Green, Jr.

E. C. Kirkland

Louise Pound

Richard J. Purcell

*Publication Office:* 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

*Editorial Office:* 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

---

## OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

### PRESIDENT

W. T. LAPRADE (*History*) Duke University

### FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER (*French Literature*) Johns Hopkins University

### SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

ZECHARIAH CHAFER, JR. (*Law*) Harvard University

### GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTAD (*Law*) Washington Office

### ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

THOMAS F. GREEN, JR. (*Law*) Washington Office

### TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

### TERM MEMBERS

#### 1940-1942

FRANK L. GRIFFIN ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	Reed College
FOWLER V. HARPER ( <i>Law</i> )	Indiana University
HELEN SARD HUGHES ( <i>English</i> )	Wellesley College
JOHN ISB ( <i>Economics</i> )	University of Kansas
G. W. MARTIN ( <i>Botany</i> )	State University of Iowa
ROY F. NICHOLS ( <i>History</i> )	University of Pennsylvania
H. L. OSTERUD ( <i>Anatomy</i> )	Medical College of Virginia
HARALD S. PATTON ( <i>Economics</i> )	Michigan State College
HORATIO SMITH ( <i>French</i> )	Columbia University
MARIE J. WEISS ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	Tulane University of Louisiana

#### 1941-1943

WILLIAM A. BROWNELL ( <i>Educational Psychology</i> )	Duke University
JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	Hunter College
CHARLOTTE D'EVERLYN ( <i>English</i> )	Mount Holyoke College
CHARLES L. JAMISON ( <i>Business Administration</i> )	University of Michigan
JOHN A. KINNEMAN ( <i>Sociology</i> )	Illinois State Normal University
ETHEL SABIN-SMITH ( <i>Psychology, Philosophy</i> )	Mills College
STANLEY S. SWARTLEY ( <i>English</i> )	Allegheny College
JOHN A. VIEG ( <i>Government</i> )	Iowa State College
PAUL W. WARD ( <i>Philosophy</i> )	Syracuse University
E. J. WORKMAN ( <i>Physics</i> )	University of New Mexico

#### 1942-1944

C. RAYMOND ADAMS ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	Brown University
M. M. BOBER ( <i>Economics</i> )	Lawrence College
WALTHER I. BRANDT ( <i>History</i> )	The City College (New York)
EUGENE PARKER CHASE ( <i>Political Science</i> )	Lafayette College
H. G. DEMING ( <i>Chemistry</i> )	University of Nebraska
RUSSELL PARSONS JAMESON ( <i>Romance Languages</i> )	Oberlin College
A. LADRU JENSEN ( <i>Law</i> )	University of Utah
*ARTHUR L. KEITH ( <i>Latin</i> )	University of South Dakota
GEORGE POPE SHANNON ( <i>English</i> )	University of Alabama
A. CURTIS WILGUS ( <i>Hispanic American History</i> )	George Washington University

### EX-PRESIDENTS

A. J. CARLSON ( <i>Physiology</i> )	University of Chicago
MARK H. INGRAHAM ( <i>Mathematics</i> )	University of Wisconsin
FREDERICK S. DEIBLER ( <i>Economics</i> )	Northwestern University

\* Deceased.

Contin  
Wilson  
8-14-43  
(Shelton)

## CONTENTS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE WAR.....	315
CONTRIBUTORS.....	317
LITERATURE FOR DEFENSE, <i>Charlton G. Laird</i> .....	318
THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE AT THE SOPHOMORE LEVEL, <i>Walter Crosby Eells</i> .....	327
MISSIONARIES IN REVERSE, <i>Robert Withington</i> .....	352
CHINA AND THE DEMOCRATIC WAY, <i>Arthur W. Hummel</i> ..	358
THE ITINERANT INSTRUCTOR, <i>Bernard N. Schilling</i> .....	369
HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SECURITY, <i>J. Harold Gold- thorpe</i> .....	380
WHAT UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AND ADMINISTRATORS OWE TO EACH OTHER, <i>Robert E. Buchanan</i> .....	395
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Nominating Committee for 1942.....	404
Regional Meetings.....	404
Chapter Activities.....	405
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	408
COUNCIL RECORD.....	409
MEMBERSHIP.....	420
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	426

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATIONAL INDEX.

## ANNUAL MEETING

The Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Association will be held in Cleveland, Ohio during the last week of December, 1942. The headquarters for the meeting and the dates will be announced in the October *Bulletin*.



## HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE WAR

The war has brought new and difficult problems to higher education. In adjusting institutional programs to meet wartime conditions, the American Association of University Professors urges that college and university administrations actively consult the faculties and make available to them the data on the basis of which decisions are to be made. The Association believes that, in situations in which curtailed income or additional obligations make necessary new financial arrangements or changes in faculty duties, the administration and the faculty should together determine the extent and the nature of the adjustments required and the means by which they can best be accomplished. The means adopted should be in accordance with the highest professional standards and of such a nature that any ensuing sacrifices may not fall unduly on any group within the institution.<sup>1</sup>

At some institutions the inauguration of accelerated programs has involved practices regarded by the American Association of University Professors as detrimental to faculty and institutional welfare. The Association also believes that some aspects of the programs themselves may be detrimental to student and faculty health. The Council of the Association has given careful consideration to the problems incident to accelerated programs and at its spring meeting held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on April 25 and 26, 1942, formulated and adopted by a unanimous vote the following statement:

### Concerning Accelerated Programs

#### *Faculty Compensation*

The Council of the American Association of University Professors recognizes that plans of acceleration (through summer

<sup>1</sup> See statement, entitled "War Adjustments," adopted by the Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, December 28, 1941, February, 1942, *Bulletin*, pp. 13-14.

sessions, extension work, night classes, and otherwise) now being initiated in various colleges and universities will create diverse problems. The Council feels that in order to make available to the nation the maximum manpower, and, in order to compensate equitably the staffs of the various institutions, the following principles should be observed:

1. A staff member should not be required to teach during the time when he normally would be free. He may have a moral obligation, however, to accept such an appointment if he is not rendering other services to the nation during that period.

2. In order to release the maximum number of faculty members for other services in connection with the war effort, the decision as to the personnel of a summer school should be made as early in the academic year as possible; and the staff should be composed chiefly of persons teaching full time.

3. Compensation should be given for teaching services in all cases in which the institution receives income from courses offered.

4. If there is no other provision for the payment of summer school salaries, such salaries should be considered a prior claim against the income derived from the summer session, *i. e.*, income derived from the summer session should not be utilized to meet salary obligations of the regular session or for other purposes until adequate summer school salaries have been paid. The same principle should apply to compensation for teaching in night school and extension classes which are in addition to the normal duties of a staff member.

5. If funds are not available to pay a reasonably adequate salary to all members of the summer school staff, special consideration should be given to persons in the lower income groups.

The preceding statement is not intended to encourage the establishment of a larger than normal total salary budget but to insure: (1) that the faculty's energies will be used efficiently in the services of the nation; and (2) that the maintenance of the salary scale for the whole faculty in the regular sessions will not be at the expense of the fraction of the staff which is called upon to teach in the summer sessions.

#### *Student and Faculty Health*

The Council of the American Association of University Professors expresses the hope that special attention will be given by the

proper authorities to the health of students and faculty members who participate in accelerated programs of instruction.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

### Contributors

ROBERT E. BUCHANAN is Dean of the Graduate College and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.

WALTER CROSBY EELLS is Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Since 1931 he has been a member of Committee J on Relation of Junior Colleges to Higher Education of the American Association of University Professors.

J. HAROLD GOLDTHORPE is Research Associate of the American Council on Education.

ARTHUR W. HUMMEL is Chief of the Division of Orientalia of the Library of Congress.

CHARLTON G. LAIRD is Assistant Professor of English at the Southern Branch of the University of Idaho. He was secretary of the chapter in 1940-1941 and president in 1941-1942.

BERNARD W. SCHILLING is Assistant Professor of English at Grinnell College.

ROBERT WITHINGTON is Professor of English at Smith College. He was secretary of the chapter in 1930-1931 and in 1929-1931 a member of the Committee on Normal Amount of Teaching and Research for Professors.

## LITERATURE FOR DEFENSE

By CHARLTON G. LAIRD

University of Idaho, Southern Branch

As we mobilize for total war, we are likely to neglect a potent weapon. We may neglect several weapons but few with more fatal consequences, I suppose, than that gentle device, the study of literature.

I am not thinking of the verbal weapons associated with total war from the Axis point of view. I am not suggesting that fifth columns overcome tanks, that lies outravish bombers, or that slogans replace reserves. We shall not want for propaganda. We may not attain the compound of wrath and inconsistency that distinguishes a Hitler, nor the courageous avowal of the inconceivable which seems to characterize some Japanese dispatches, but propaganda we shall have. Our cup shall run over. So much, even our advertising copywriters will warrant, but I am not thinking of propaganda. I refer to those gentler productions which are called literature, and which are usually frankly and consciously artistic. They constitute a weapon more powerful than we sometimes suppose.

To understand this, we must remind ourselves that we lost the First Phase of the World War. After 1919 we thought we had won it; after 1929 we concluded that nobody had won it; shortly after 1939 we were forced to recognize that Germany had won it. To decide who wins a war, we learned, you must first decide which battle you count as the last one. Germany had practiced the hoary trick of shamming dead; that she did not assume the rôle quite voluntarily does not detract from the brilliance with which she played the rôle, nor did it prevent her from duping her supposed slayers. For in 1918 whatever the Allies had been fighting was not dead. Americans did not understand this, nor did most Europeans. Thinking that the war was over, how could we foresee that the main war was yet to be fought?

## II

Let us review the situation in those days when we thought we had won a war. The visible foe was humbled, and beyond the Rhine were emaciated remnants, German boys and old men. With invisible foes we were not much concerned; that there might be moles in the Allied eye—narrow-mindedness, greed, ignorance, impracticality, fascism—would have seemed impertinent, if true. We were victors, and the long horror was over; what would you more? Nothing more, surely, except to extend to all the world the blessings of our new peace, to be sure that all wars were done. Since the world was to participate, the world needed a government; we provided one, called the League of Nations, and went home.

The League, most people may now admit, was well enough so far as it went. It did not go very far, because we had not thought very far. We had not thought about peace, not only because we were very busy thinking about war, but because we did not suppose that thinking about peace was necessary. We did not see the enemy, obscured in peace. We did not appreciate the dangers inherent in maldistribution of raw materials and markets, in the use of quotas and tariffs. We did not assay the disunity of the Allies: we ignored the fact that Japan was fascist, that Italy was anything but democratic, that France and Britain disagreed basically as to the manner in which Europe should be run, that Russia was in confusion and fighting off her old allies, that America knew little of international affairs and wanted to know less. We ignored the fact that democratic world government must rest, not only upon "the consent of the governed," but upon a desire of the governed to be governed. We forgot that the world had not been regenerated; Germany might have been regenerated, but she was held down; China and Russia were being regenerated, but regeneration takes time. France and Great Britain had been lusty and grasping imperialists; they remained mature and jealous imperialists. America was too naïve to understand what was happening and provincial enough to feel like the country bumpkin done for a cleaning by the city slicker. The little countries which were at once practical and idealistic were too small and too few.

Of the big nations, Italy wanted Fiume, Japan wanted a free hand in Asia, Russia wanted a world revolution, France wanted a Syrian mandate, Great Britain wanted her world trade, and we wanted our war debts. The few who were willing to sacrifice for world peace did not appreciate that hard jobs cannot be legislated, that success grows from work, mistakes, intelligence, and education; that a League of Nations cannot be set up. We did not understand that world government, and its resultant world peace, has to be earned and learned; it cannot be established.

True, we might have done better at establishing. We should have recognized that a world government must be world-wide and must be a government. We might, however, have succeeded. In spite of the gerrymandering in conference, in spite of the ethnic horror that was solemnly pronounced a map of Europe, in spite of great gaps in the "world" government, the makeshift League of Nations might have grown big enough for its job. At the time, all was confusion. Looking back we can see several possibilities. Had the Treaty of Versailles been revised earlier, and democratic elements in Germany given more support, the basic trouble might have been curable. Had the signatories been a little more willing to implement their puppet super-state, the League might have survived its critical years. Above all, had the United States joined and supported the federation it had seemed to sponsor, the League might have had the resources it needed.

### III

In 1919 there was one nation strong enough in money, in goods, in manpower, and in vitality to do almost anything it wished, to get almost anything it wanted. There was one nation sufficiently isolated and sufficiently dominant in its own geographical area to be immune from attack—as attack went in those days. There was one nation wealthy enough to be able to afford to gamble, to lose a few millions of anything for the sake of world peace for all time. These nations were all one, and we were that nation. To glimpse what we might have done, we have only to remember the tremendous power of Herbert Hoover in 1919, although he was but meagerly equipped and his power erratically used. The rest of



the world was sick, and we had the medicine; it was starving, and we had the food. We could have bought as much decent international behavior as we wanted. But we did not much want it. We wanted to go home and collect our war debts. Who would not now give up the war debts we never collected, for the war in which, apparently, we are to be paid with good interest?

Thus, although the Allied armies and navies seemed to win the First Phase of the World War, Allied statesmen started to lose it and Allied populations—particularly the American population—finished the job. We were probably too ignorant to write a world peace, and were certainly too provincial to make one work if it had been written. That we were provincial is understandable, but it was not necessary. We were provincial because we wanted to be. New England intellectualism had given way, first to the frontier, then to immigration and industrialization; the average American read something quite trivial, if he read anything at all. If he went abroad, he went to say he had been there, and to have the fun of coming back. Typical was the pronouncement of a mid-western judge who returned from across the Atlantic: "All the castles of Europe are not so beautiful as one Iowa cornfield," and the significant detail is that scores of small-town editors reprinted the words with a triumphant headline, "The Judge Was Right!" The average American had not read a hundred pages of Tolstoy, Goethe, Balzac, nor of any other continental master, and he felt no lack. The "cultured" American was not much better. As a democratic people we were in no condition to take leadership in a world order, nor to accept a peace that would make world order possible.

Now we are in the Second Phase of the World War, and whether there is to be a third, or a fourth, or a tenth phase probably depends much upon the understanding of the American public. Since Warsaw, we had known that if culture as we know it was to be preserved, we must preserve it. Since Sedan, we have known that no one can preserve the kind of world we thought we were living in, and that if we want a part in making a different world, we shall have to fight for the privilege. Since Pearl Harbor, we have known that we shall fight; we may or may not avail ourselves of the opportunity to make a better world. Thus, the question raised

by Pearl Harbor is not, "Was the Navy asleep?" It is, "Will the average American continue asleep?" That is, shall we have an enlightened public that will demand and support a world order?

#### IV

I have tried to suggest that an American public with an informed and intelligent interest in other peoples might have ended the World War at what we must now call the First Phase of the World War, that the League of Nations was made a Jonah by generations of provincial teachers of history and literature before it was jettisoned by isolationist senators. Shall we do any better this time? The job will be bigger, because we shall have to remake most of the map of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the South Seas, and we must consider a whole complex of problems arising out of raw materials, markets, and ethnic groups, problems that were brushed aside or glossed over in 1919. We shall, however, have some advantages.

The details of our situation cannot be discussed here, but there is reason to believe that, for the Second Phase of the World War, America will have more enlightened statesmen, a more understanding and disillusioned public, and a more promising alignment of peoples than we had in 1919. As to the statesmen, they should be better informed.<sup>1</sup> For the public, no one who was young in 1919, as I was, and has since watched succeeding classes of students, can doubt that the young man of 1942 is very different from his predecessor a quarter of a century before. The modern youth may simplify war into a sport for the Merchants of Death, but at least he knows that war is butcher's business in which, one way or another, all good men lose. And something of this difference can be observed, also, in the other age groups. For the national groups involved, we now have the powerful fascist governments in one camp, and the great peace-loving peoples—Great Britain, the United States, China, and Russia—in the other. Doubtless few outside the Axis countries will deny that the first three of these, along with many South American and subjugated European countries, would wish the drafting of a just peace. Not all people

<sup>1</sup>There is evidence that our statesmen are better informed. Since this was written our State Department has started buying futures on good government, using Lend-Lease for payments.



would agree that Russia wants peace, but we might remind ourselves that Russia proposed world disarmament when not even we would follow, and that some of Russia's crimes now seem more venial than they did. There is evidence, for instance, that the purged army officers constituted a healthy fifth column; had they stayed in Moscow, Hitler might be there, too.

Whether or not we can agree about the character and history of Russia, we can probably agree that four great nations are likely to emerge from an Allied victory, and that since the post-war world must be ordered by force, these nations will order it. Of these four, China is likely to be weakest. Torn between the Chiang Kai-Shek government and the communists, between the progressive modernists and the world's most amazing museum of robber barons, her attitude is uncertain. At best she will be impoverished, and poverty will not write the peace. Great Britain and Russia have common weaknesses: a strained economy and a mutual mistrust. The latter is perhaps the more dangerous. British Tories have placed little faith in the democracy of Russian communists, and the Soviets have felt there are powerful Britons whose loyalty to class is stronger than their loyalty to democracy. Thus, the major question of the war may yet be: can inter-class rivalry be subjugated to international need?

There remains one great nation. As in 1919, it is one of the nations which possess abundant resources. It was the last great nation to enter the war, and it is the great nation least in danger of attack; thus its resources are least likely to be impaired. As in 1919, it is the nation best able to gamble on the future, which by its standard of living has the greatest stake in a peaceful world, and which is least hampered by geographical position and social disturbance. It is probably the most trusted great nation. And, as in 1919, it has food, enough to buy good government with butter, while enforcing it with guns. Thus, the United States has the opportunity to assume the leadership of the world when the world shall desperately need a leader. But will we assume this leadership?

In the present state of our national mind we probably would not. What will be the impact of casualty lists, atrocities, sacrifice, and suffering no one can say, but we shall need to grow in knowl-

edge, in sympathy, and in understanding if we come through the war with a public sufficiently informed and humane. We must think of the world as populated with men and women and children, not with treacherous Japs, beastly Nazis, and damned Wops, or with hordes of yellow, black, and brown fellows, who are outlandish and quite inconsequential. The growth of an intelligent public can be encouraged with the study of world literature, and I know of no other way in which so much can be done with so little. Anyone who reads Tolstoy, Dostoevski, and Gorki must think of Russians as lovable, human people. Anyone who knows Thomas Mann and Arnold Zweig will see that Germans are not all beastly. Anyone who reads Deledda Grazia's *The Mother* will understand that Mussolini is not Italy. Anyone who reads Seppänen's *Sun and Storm* will gain background for understanding the vexed Karelian tangle, and anyone who knows Japanese—but most libraries have almost no Japanese literature. Small wonder we are at war with Japan. In fact, few libraries in this country have any adequate representation of literatures west of American or east of Greek, and courses in world literature, if they are taught at all, are too often presented as though letters began with Solomon and Homer and ended shortly before James Joyce.

## V

Admittedly, international acquaintance is no guarantee of international good will; you probably cannot inspire in Hitler a restrained passion for peace on earth by reading Shelley to him. But if a people wants peace, as I believe the American people do want peace, you can help them get it by educating them for it. With literature you can help Americans see other people in their homes, think with their minds, feel with their hearts, see life with their eyes. If a reasonable number of us can learn to do that, we shall know that people are not primarily tricky Japs or raisers of Argentine beef, however they may seem to us when we are fighting for Singapore or for markets. They are not primarily anything you can put a label to, unless you say that they are human, and that they can be humane.

Admittedly, also, the colleges cannot in a few years convert the

average American to the devoted reading of Dostoevski. It is doubtful if the average American can ever be so converted. But some things we can do. We can encourage a broader understanding and a broader view on the part of those who mould American thought, and we can start laying a broader foundation for the outlook of the next generation, the generation which will have to save the peace. Specifically, we can do the following:

1. Recognize that literature is the intimate record of man in all ages, and see to it that established courses are taught from this point of view, even though the course is called *Beowulf to Thomas Hardy*;

2. See to it that courses in world literature are established, and that more students take these courses, especially students who are likely to find a place in life influencing men's minds: teachers, journalists, lawyers, government servants, and mothers;

3. Encourage the display of comparative literature in libraries, the sale of such literature in book stores, the translation of foreign works, and the study of languages;

4. Cooperate with those who are endeavoring to promote the teaching of comparative literature, for instance, in the group being organized through the secretaryship of Professor Arthur E. Christy of the Department of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University;<sup>1</sup>

5. Encourage interest in comparative literature in the secondary schools, urge those schools to work through the P.T.A. organizations, and try to make use of local adult education machinery;

6. Try to help men in public office to see the importance of world literature, that in a larger sense it is a defense weapon of the first importance.

## VI

The need is urgent. And if the time is short, at least the occasion has arisen which makes much possible in little time. In this

<sup>1</sup> Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, XXVIII (1942), pp. 283-292. Under date of May 13 Professor Christy writes that he is seeking people interested in comparative literature "who would work *con amore*, and who could offer suggestions and carry them out." I take it he will welcome correspondence from anyone who thinks this description fits him.

connection, perhaps I may be pardoned a personal reference. For a number of years I have puzzled my classes in literature with a lecture in which I tried to explain what I was endeavoring to teach. I suggested that art helps us to understand the creative spirit, which in turn leads us to man's central problem, understanding his own culture; that art is the integrated approach to life, that it ought to enrich our lives and cultivate our sympathy and understanding; that it would fit us for citizenship in the world state that alone could make the modern world endurable. I added that for most men, literature is the most understandable of the arts because it employs the most familiar and most understandable medium, words. This lecture always aroused curiosity, not unlike that of wild animals which are timid but not really frightened, spying upon a strange and inexplicable creature. My students watched, listened, made some bewildered effort to understand why I seemed to be excited, and forgot. I was as one crying in the wilderness.

Then came December 7 and Pearl Harbor. I used my familiar lecture, but I was crying in a wilderness no longer. The desert had acquired ears, and the wild creatures understanding. When I said we were in this war because we had lost the last one, and we had lost the last one because we did not have enough knowledge of peoples throughout the world to make a workable peace, they were interested. When I added that the assigned novels would help them to build a society which could make a practicable peace, they understood. Suddenly, I had begun to teach. Not that I deserve the credit; the credit should go to the Japanese pilots over Pearl Harbor and to the men who sent them. Their pedagogical methods may savor of the old school, but they have their effect. They will have still more effect if we who are professed teachers of literature seize the opportunity they have offered us. There may yet be time for America to discover that world peace must be learned and earned, and that we must earn and learn it.

## THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE AT THE SOPHOMORE LEVEL<sup>1</sup>

By WALTER CROSBY EELLS

American Association of Junior Colleges

At intervals during the past 50 years or more there have been sporadic discussions of shortening the college course and conferring the commonly recognized baccalaureate degree or degrees for less than the normal four-year college course of study or its equivalent. The question has suddenly become acute, however, with the recently announced intention of one of the leading American universities to grant the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level.

I regret exceedingly that this issue has been raised, particularly in time of war, when in my judgment the forces of higher education should be united as never before. But it has been raised, after a close vote on the part of the responsible faculty of the University of Chicago, and therefore in true American fashion deserves, and will doubtless receive, full, free, and furious discussion.

As I understand the plan of the University of Chicago, it is to confer the bachelor's degree at the conclusion of a normal four-year curriculum of "general" education which is to begin with the junior year in high school and close with the commonly understood sophomore year in the present college or university. Successful completion of the curriculum will be determined primarily by a comprehensive examination. Thus, the degree may be given even earlier than at the sophomore level.

<sup>1</sup> Portion of an address, "Changes in Higher Education—Wise and Otherwise," given at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars in Chicago, Illinois, on April 14, 1942 and to the Council of the American Association of University Professors in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on April 26, 1942. A condensation of this paper was subsequently given in a panel discussion on "The Bachelor's Degree" at the twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education in Chicago, Illinois, on May 2, 1942. In the July, 1942 issue of *The Educational Record* there will be published the statements presented on the latter occasion by the following persons: Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago; Homer P. Rainey, President of the University of Texas; William P. Tolley, President of Allegheny College; and Walter Crosby Eells, Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

With certain phases of this challenging proposal I find myself in most hearty accord. For years we in the junior college field have been insisting that there is a marked break at about the end of the sophomore year or of the junior college—that many students should and do complete their formal college education at this level and that those who continue should change their academic emphasis markedly at this point. President Hutchins proposes to dignify this important point of educational achievement with a significant college degree. I am in cordial and emphatic agreement. I think, however, he does not go far enough. I would not limit a college degree to students who have completed a course only in general education. I have advocated and expect to continue to advocate a college degree for all college students who by the sophomore level complete any rational curriculum of college grade, whether general, vocational, technical, or any combination of these elements best fitted to the needs of the particular student. It is the college student and his needs that are important and deserve the recognition of a college degree, not any particular type of curriculum. Many junior colleges are now giving a college degree for various terminal curricula and many others are planning to do so. This seems to me eminently wise and desirable. A college degree is more significant for the junior college terminal student than for the transfer student who presumably will ultimately secure a higher degree. Note, however, that I have referred to *a college degree*, not *the bachelor's degree*. I shall return to this distinction later.

President Hutchins' proposals are by no means limited to the University of Chicago. It is obvious, of course, that they have marked implications for the universities, the senior colleges, and the junior colleges of the country. With reference to the junior colleges, however, he leaves no possible room for doubt. In the first official announcement of the plan, President Hutchins applies it to all junior colleges as well. He says:

The 600 junior colleges of the country are at present an anomaly in the educational system . . . If they, too, decide to award the bachelor's degree at the end of two years, their position will be regularized and stabilized.



In other statements, some of which I shall quote later, he has spoken still more strongly, not only suggesting but urging that all junior colleges adopt the same plan. The matter, therefore, becomes one of vital importance to junior college people. They have not invited this controversy. They would have much preferred to avoid it, particularly in wartime. They want unity and cooperation, not disunity and competition. At the same time they will not shrink from the discussion if it is forced upon them.

I want to make it very clear, however, that in what I shall say I am not speaking officially for the junior colleges of the United States nor for the American Association of Junior Colleges of which I am an officer. I am speaking only as an individual observer and student of the junior college movement and of higher education in general. I have had no opportunity to poll the junior colleges on the subject since the vote taken by the University of Chicago faculty. I have sounded out the members of our Executive Committee and find that they vary from strong approval to strong condemnation. May I repeat, therefore, that I am speaking only as an individual, not as an official junior college representative.

I regret exceedingly to say that, although cordially approving the Chicago proposal in some respects, in other respects, after considerable study and thought, I have reached the conviction that it is distinctly *undesirable*, *unnecessary*, and *unfortunate*. In the next few minutes I shall give reasons for each of these three adverse characterizations.

I, myself, have held a degree for more than 30 years from the University of Chicago, and have taken great pride and satisfaction in it—not in the degree in itself but in the work for which it stands and of which it is a convenient symbol. I owe much to this, my second alma mater. It is not easy for a son to turn against his fostering mother. It is much pleasanter to praise and protect her. But even filial loyalty should not be a deterrent if the mother seems to have gone astray in the academic world. Incidentally, I am glad that my own Chicago degree is the master's and not the bachelor's!

## II

My first major statement is that *the proposed change is undesirable*—and for a number of reasons.

For one thing, it is not clear to me as to just what is meant by "general education," although I have read many articles about it and numerous definitions of it. I hope the intent of the Chicago plan and that proposed for all junior colleges is not necessarily to be restricted to the present Chicago type of general education. Does general education necessarily mean all required courses or is broad freedom of election to be permitted? Must it mean general survey courses? Must it be based upon 100 great books? Or on 100 current magazines? Or perchance on 100 modern movies? Does it necessarily involve comprehensive examinations? Must it close at the sophomore level or can there be a mixture of general and specific, of cultural and vocational, in the upper division? Can there be a similar mixture rather than exclusively general education in the junior college? Is shop work general or vocational? It may be vocational for the mechanic, but desirably avocational for the photographer. Many such questions need clarification before the proposal is accepted in its entirety.

I question its desirability for another reason. When will the Chicago student be ready for the bachelor's degree? I understand that approximately 10 per cent of the students at Chicago complete the present "College" in less than the common two years, often in only one year. Under the new plan such students, presumably, will have their bachelor's degree in only one year beyond the common high school level. If Chicago goes a step further and admits superior high school juniors to present freshman standing, perhaps they can secure the bachelor's degree at the same time or even before their high school colleagues receive their high school diplomas. Do we agree that such acceleration is desirable—even for the exceptional student?

In order to answer this question may I take a few minutes to consider the desirable length of time to spend on a college course? I am inclined to question seriously the wisdom of the tendency in some quarters, independently of abnormal wartime conditions, to speed up the educational process too rapidly. There are those who



argue that a student should be given his college degree as soon as he reaches a certain minimum level of knowledge and competence—usually as measured by some type of comprehensive examination. He knows enough, they say, and he ought to get through with his college education earlier in order to get into life earlier. It seems to me this viewpoint completely ignores the fact that there are many values to a true college education aside from the purely intellectual ones, and that many of these as well as the more significant intellectual values cannot be measured validly by any tests or examinations yet devised or likely to be devised in the near future.

I fear the matter of examinations may be greatly overdone—that some universities may be in danger of becoming chiefly examination institutions instead of instructional and developmental institutions. A college education should presumably involve development of factors of personality, of general competence, of potential leadership—of social and emotional and spiritual qualities. Many of these cannot be easily hurried even if the student apparently may have mastered the prescribed curriculum content and stand at the 98th percentile on a general information test! I taught courses in tests and measurements for some years. I recognize their value. I am enthusiastic about them. I have also learned to be cautious. Those who have had the greatest experience in the field of standard tests are usually those who also recognize the severe limitations of these tests, not only in the matter of individual reliability, but also in their inability to measure and evaluate the many other vital if intangible qualities which go to make up a complete college education. College is not only achievement; it is also experience. And experience, we know, does take time.

Even in the narrower field of curriculum content, I question whether we are thinking in the most helpful terms when we plan to accept a minimum level or threshold of knowledge as a sufficient criterion for graduation. One school of thought holds that material or content is the basic unit. They say: As soon as a student gives tangible evidence of having mastered that content, he should be graduated, whether he has been in college one, two, three, four, five, or six years. Another school of thought holds that time in

residence is a better educational unit for the average or typical student. Should the college student be encouraged to scurry through his curriculum as fast as possible, or should he remain in college the normal amount of time, and if he is especially gifted spend that time in getting just that much more of life-long value from an "enriched curriculum" rather than hurrying on to join an advanced group to which he may not be socially adjusted or emotionally matured? In other words, should college encourage speed or thoroughness and enrichment? I confess that I am inclined to favor strongly time as the better basic unit. I feel the college student is likely to get much more of value for later life from his total college experience if he remains for the entire period, taking only the normal number of courses each year, and, if his superior ability permits, being encouraged and stimulated to do distinctly superior work and to benefit additionally by supplementary and collateral work in the curriculum, in student activities, and in other fields.

I grant, of course, that for certain individual students acceleration even in normal times is desirable, but in such cases it seems to me the acceleration may best be achieved through extra time in summer sessions in which the full equivalence of time and experience in residence is provided, rather than by some of the other methods proposed.

We are told that a student cannot afford to spend so long in preparation for life, particularly if he has a professional school and possible internship to look forward to after securing his bachelor's degree. I am inclined to believe that some of our educators, however, influenced unduly by this argument, may overlook a very significant biological and social change of the past 40 years. I refer to the marked increase in average length of life in the United States in the twentieth century. For a boy born in 1900, the average expectation of life was 48 years; for a girl, 51 years. Today, however, the progress of medical science has been so great that the average for a boy is now 61 years; for a girl, 65 years. Suppose one or two or even three years are added to the time of preparation for most effective entrance into occupational and civic life. The average young man can look forward to 13 more years of total life than could his father; the young woman can have 14

more years than did her mother to more than compensate for possible added years of preparation.

The complexities of modern life and the developments in the field of science, both natural and social, demand a more extensive as well as intensive preparation than was needed in the simpler time of our parents and grandparents. There is more to learn in order to be adequately prepared to live successfully in a socially complex and increasingly mechanical age. We may properly expect to take a little longer to learn it, except, of course, in wartime when our very existence may depend upon all possible speed in prompt and early minimum, if not completely adequate, preparation.

All industrial and occupational trends for the past 50 years and prospects for the next 50 years, abnormal wartime needs excepted, indicate probable shorter hours of labor and later entry into productive activity. We should remember, too, that in the words of one of our great educational philosophers, education is not primarily preparation for life—it is life itself—in many respects the fullest, the richest, and the most satisfying life the young man or young woman will ever experience. Why advocate as a permanent and universal policy an attempt to hurry through it with unnecessary speed?

The world's Supreme Teacher, 1900 years ago on the shores of Galilee, told the story of the men, perhaps they were students, with varied numbers of talents. To one their master gave ten talents, to another five, to another one. He told them to make the best use possible of these talents for a stated period of time until he returned to ask for an accounting or final examination. He did not say: "As soon as you have succeeded in amassing five extra talents you are ready to take an examination and graduate." Note that the young men with varied talents all stayed on the job the same length of time. Quite logically, the one with the largest number of talents had the most to show for his time and effort, but each one who used all his talents to the best of his ability received the same commendation in his graduation diploma, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The only one who "flunked the course" was the one who refused to use his talent and idled away his time instead—perhaps in the local

country club. If modern psychology has taught us anything, it has taught us that student talents vary widely. I feel our job in college should be to aid every student to develop those talents to the best of his ability during his entire college course—not to say to him, "As soon as you have reached a barely minimum level of achievement you are ready to graduate." College should accentuate individual differences, not minimize them.

The most important reason, however, why the proposal is undesirable is that the bachelor's degree already has a long-standing, well-established meaning very different from that now proposed. If we could wipe the slate clean and start over again in American education, there might be some merit in the new plan. But we cannot wipe the slate clean. We cannot abolish history. We cannot disregard the fact that the bachelor's degree, marking the conclusion of the typical four-year college course, rests upon long historical usage, commencing with the first conferring of that degree at Harvard College in 1642—exactly 300 years ago; that its use under more nearly uniform and standardized conditions has been greatly accentuated during the present century; that hundreds of higher educational institutions now possess established priority rights; that more than 3,000,000 men and women living in the United States today have secured the bachelor's degree and have some rights in asking that its meaning be not suddenly debased.

For many years in earlier life in the Far West (before, in the eyes of my engineering colleagues, I degenerated into the field of education) I was a civil engineer. As such, I was frequently called upon to make surveys to settle boundary disputes, to determine the correct position of line fences, and to adjust claims to common territory. It was not long before I learned the principle of law which the legal profession terms "adverse possession." In early days in the West, the original land surveys were made by contract and let out to the lowest bidder. Some early surveyors were none too conscientious and were more interested in making money than in establishing with precision the exact location of fundamental township and section corners on land that was considered of little value anyway. As a result, I sometimes found cases where a man's line fence was as much as 50 to 100 feet away from where it

should have been if the original corners had been correctly located. But the courts have held, and with equity I think, that if a man in good faith has had undisputed possession of land for a period of years (varying somewhat in different jurisdictions) his boundary fence would remain unchanged regardless of where it possibly should have been if all surveys originally had been made correctly, unless decided otherwise by mutual agreement of the parties at interest.

I feel the situation is somewhat parallel now in higher education. Hundreds of American colleges for far more than the minimum legal period have had "adverse possession" of the bachelor's degree as the legitimate and commonly recognized boundary of their academic territory. Please note that I am not stating that this was an error in this case. I am only saying that even if, for the sake of argument, we should admit that different academic boundaries might have been established originally, the principle of adverse possession is as valid for education as for real estate—if not more so. Those now possessing bachelor's degrees (with all the rights, privileges, and boundaries pertaining thereto) have prior claims—have the rights of adverse possession. Changes can be made with fairness to all concerned only if the parties at interest concur in those changes. This, I think, you will find is sound legal doctrine. It is also, in my judgment, ordinary honesty, recognized ethics, and good common sense.

There is another exceedingly important reason why this plan seems to me undesirable. It is certain to engender collegiate rivalry and hostility. Not for a long time, if ever, are the four-year liberal arts colleges going to surrender their rights to the baccalaureate degree and to their particular types of curricula. We have heard, of course, frequent and vigorous assertions that the American college is decadent, anomalous, antiquated, and slated for the academic junk pile. I note, however, that for a dying institution it seems to have preserved quite surprising vigor and vitality and continues to make outstanding contributions to American civilization. Evidently it has more lives even than the proverbial pussy. I am sure the American college needs no defense from me.

The junior colleges also have their place in American education

and in American civilization. What is that place? Is the junior college a young upstart in the field of higher education, greedily attempting to usurp the fields already adequately occupied by established institutions, or does it have a legitimate place in the total pattern of American education? Is it a rival or an ally?

Article I of my educational creed for the past several years has been that the junior colleges and the senior colleges should not be rivals but friendly partners in a common cause—that they are not in competition but in cooperation. This conviction has been the guiding principle of all my work in the executive secretaryship of the American Association of Junior Colleges, in the editorship of *The Junior College Journal*, and in junior college addresses and other activities. Nor am I alone in this belief. A few months ago, in order to check on my own educational creed, I secured from almost 2,000 representative educators and laymen in all parts of the country answers to the question: "Do you feel that the junior college is primarily an institution in competition or in cooperation with other institutions of higher education?" The answers were five to one in favor of an interpretation of the junior college as a cooperating, not as a competing, institution.

I think I have been able to see some positive and constructive outcomes of the policy I have been trying to follow based upon this fundamental article of my educational creed. Unfortunately, I have seen unhappy results where junior and senior colleges are hostile to each other. I have seen happy results in other states where they are working in cooperation and harmony.

If, however, all or even a large proportion of the junior colleges of the country should now follow President Hutchins' advice and begin giving the bachelor's degree while the liberal arts colleges continue their present practice, what would happen to this friendly relationship and cooperative spirit based upon mutual respect for each other's academic rights and privileges? I shall venture to answer this question in terms of a quotation from an address which I gave before the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at Atlantic City last November, because this gives my considered views before the present controversy was precipitated. Speaking of the possible use of the bachelor's degree by the junior colleges, I said:



I cannot conceive of any procedure likely to develop greater antagonism, rivalry, hostility, misunderstanding, and academic hairpulling on the part of the senior colleges and the junior colleges. It seems to me vastly preferable as a practical example of friendly cooperation rather than of unfriendly competition that so many junior colleges have made the decision or are rapidly making the decision to adopt instead a distinctive and unique degree of their own to represent a significant degree of collegiate educational progress. They are not attempting to usurp the use of the baccalaureate degree to which the four-year American college has had proprietary rights, or what the legal profession would term adverse possession, for more than 300 years.

My feelings on this matter are unchanged.

Do the junior colleges want to give the baccalaureate degree? Frankly, I do not know their attitude now, but last year I asked them all this question: "Do you favor the bachelor's degree at the end of junior college?" Of replies received from about 500, only 8 per cent were favorable, and many of this small minority qualified their approval in some way. How their minds may have changed as a result of President Hutchins' advice, I have, of course, no means of knowing.

Instead of calmly attempting to appropriate our neighbors' academic property in the form of the bachelor's degree, how much more commendable is the action of former President Lowell of Harvard University. In 1910 Harvard, in cooperation with Radcliffe and Tufts, initiated the use of the degree of Associate in Arts to mark the successful conclusion of four years of extension work, and numerous individuals received this degree in the next 20 years. Ten years ago, however, President Lowell wrote a formal letter to the president of the American Association of Junior Colleges explaining the 20-year use of the Associate in Arts degree at Harvard but stating that

... this title has been put to such general use for two years of college work that we have felt bound to abandon it and in consequence we have adopted for extension work, equivalent to a full four-years' college course, "Adjunct in Arts." It seems wise to stake out a claim in this way to a new name for a degree, and unless you have heard of its use before, I should be grateful if you would make a note of our claiming possession of it in fee simple.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Junior College Journal*, Vol. 4, p. 153, December, 1933.

The mother of American universities thus did a generous and gracious thing as well as an honest and sensible thing and helped to clarify any possible confusion in the field of academic degrees by formally renouncing the degree which President Lowell recognized had come to be regarded as the characteristic junior college degree. How much wider this use has become in the ten years since President Lowell's letter was written, I shall report presently. I think no one could or would raise the slightest objection if the University of Chicago or any other university wishes to establish a new degree with a new meaning for a new curriculum which it wishes to establish.

### III

My second main point is that *the proposed change is unnecessary*. It is unnecessary principally because, as just pointed out, there is already a well-established college degree which is more and more commonly given by junior colleges and by senior colleges and universities as well to mark the close of general education or of various specialized curricula at the sophomore level. I refer, of course, to the well-known associate's degree or title, first used in this country at the University of Chicago under the leadership of its great president, William Rainey Harper. Thirty years earlier, however, it was given at the University of Durham and other British institutions for completion of a two-year collegiate course of study. I have been gathering material for an extensive monograph on the associate's degree which I hope to have ready for publication in a few weeks. This, of course, is not the time or place to reproduce that monograph. You may be interested, however, to learn of a few facts which may not be generally known.

I have a record, obviously not complete, of more than 100,000 young men and young women who have received the associate's degree or title in American junior colleges in the past 20 years. Approximately 90,000 have received the Associate in Arts, one-tenth as many the Associate in Science, while the balance are scattered in other fields. It is now awarded in at least 245 junior colleges in 40 of the 44 states in which junior colleges are located. The use of it is growing rapidly. Some 14,000 were conferred last year alone.



The use of the associate's degree is also becoming increasingly common in American senior colleges and universities to signify the completion of two years of collegiate work. The University of Chicago itself awarded the Associate in Arts or Science to some 4,500 students in earlier years. The University of Minnesota has used it for several years to mark completion of the two-year course in their General College—general education, although not exactly of the Chicago pattern. The University of California, both in its Berkeley and its Los Angeles divisions, decided only this year to abandon its former long-standing junior certificate and to confer the degree of Associate in Arts on all who complete the lower division in its major undergraduate colleges. Note the reason given:

The purpose of the degree is to accentuate the function of the first two years of college as general education rather than as specialized education and to give to those who withdraw from college at this point some significant recognition of the course of studies they have completed.

Following this action, the State Board of Education in California, less than seven weeks ago, granted the same right to all the 47 public junior colleges in the state to grant the degree of Associate in Arts. For some 10 years previously they had been giving it, but had been calling it a title, if that is any important distinction. Now they are all to give definite college degrees—but not, you will note, the bachelor's degree. California institutions—both junior and senior—have mutual respect for their neighbor's property rights and boundary fences. American University only last month, by vote of the faculty, decided to give the degree of Associate in Administration for a combination of general and specialized work, part of it on the upper division level, but totaling 63 semester hours or two standard college years. The University of Nebraska has recently announced a group of new two-year curricula to be marked by the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, etc. Less than two weeks ago the faculty of Birmingham-Southern College in Alabama voted to confer the Associate in Arts degree.

All of the state teachers colleges in Connecticut have been authorized to grant the degree of Associate in Arts to students who

complete general two-year curricula prior to entrance upon life activities or to professional specialization in the upper division. It is under consideration by state teachers colleges in New Jersey. The Associate in Arts is authorized by law in several states and favored by the chief educational officers in others. I shall publish details in the monograph already mentioned.

Thus, we find the associate's degree or title widely and increasingly used without criticism by increasing numbers of junior colleges, senior colleges, teachers colleges, and universities to mark the successful completion of a two-year course of study.

It is true that the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has for many years had a provision in its standards that "junior colleges shall not grant degrees." It has changed this prohibition completely, however, in its statement adopted a few weeks ago as a result of the Chicago proposals—or rather it has interpreted that prohibition as applying only to baccalaureate degrees. The statement formulated by the Commission on Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, adopted by that Association in February, 1942, reads in part as follows:

There is no objection on the part of this Commission to the use of the Associate in Arts title or degree for the completion of the equivalent of a two-year collegiate course of study, but it urges that the baccalaureate degree should continue to signify the completion of a four-year collegiate course of study.

Correspondence that has come to my office in the past few months from a variety of institutions in different states, hearings before special legislative committees to which I have been invited, and state junior college conventions evidence an increasing interest in the associate's degree and approval of it as the appropriate and desirable degree to symbolize the completion of the equivalent of a two-year college curriculum at the sophomore level. None except Chicago, as far as I have heard, has been advocating the use of the bachelor's degree for this purpose. We all remember the story of the new soldier who claimed that all the rest of the regiment was out of step except himself!

President Hutchins' line of argument, if I interpret it correctly, is as follows:

- (a) General education should close at the sophomore level.
- (b) This achievement should be marked by a college degree.
- (c) The appropriate degree is the bachelor's degree, regardless of the fact that it is used and has been used for many years by hundreds of American colleges and universities with an entirely different meaning.

To my mind, this is distinctly a *non sequitur* argument. There is a noticeable hiatus between the second and third propositions. Is it not exactly as logical and decidedly more ethical to argue as follows?

- (a) General education should close at the sophomore level.
- (b) This achievement should be marked by a college degree.
- (c) The appropriate degree is the one already in general use at that level, the associate's degree—or possibly a new one designed for the purpose and not already used by other institutions with a different meaning.

Even if we should admit all of President Hutchins' arguments regarding the nature of general education and the desirable reorganization of the American school system, it would not at all follow that it should be signalized by the bachelor's degree. On the contrary, in view of all the circumstances, the bachelor's degree appears to be particularly inappropriate and uncalled for.

These are the principal reasons I feel the Chicago proposal for a bachelor's degree is *unnecessary*.

#### IV

I come now to my third major point: *the proposed change is unfortunate*—unfortunate both in method and in time.

First, as to method. Many of us can remember the period when conditions with reference to the bachelor's degree were sadly confused and standards were lamentably low or entirely lacking. The situation was particularly unfortunate in the South. It cannot be

better stated briefly than in the following excerpt from the recent resolution adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools:

For many years the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has labored unremittingly for reasonable uniformity in standards of achievement as the basis for the granting of degrees. During the first and second decades of this century there were institutions in this region which granted the bachelor's degree for only one or two years of bona fide college work. The result was confusion as to the meaning of college on the part of students, their parents, and the general public. After strenuous efforts over a long period, the unfortunate situation has been largely eliminated.

Academic chaos, however, was by no means confined to the South. It was country-wide. There were even high schools, both North and South, which were conferring the bachelor's degree on their graduates. One was located in the city of Philadelphia, which still grants the bachelor's degree to all its graduates.

To correct such chaotic conditions in higher education was one of the chief reasons for the organization of the various regional accrediting associations. They have established Commissions on Higher Education, developed statements of reasonable standards, and revised these standards in the light of developing academic opinion and majority judgment. They have labored continuously to apply these standards to existing institutions and have encouraged them to improve themselves to such an extent that they might be worthy to confer the bachelor's or the associate's or other recognized college degrees with honor to themselves and with satisfaction to their constituents. They have brought order out of chaos—or near chaos.

Some junior colleges in the membership of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools have wanted to conduct unconventional experiments in particular types of education somewhat at variance with some of the commonly accepted standards. Without serious difficulty they have secured from the North Central Association authorization and approval of such experiments and appointment of committees to aid in working them

out and in evaluating their results. When, however, my second alma mater wants to do something unconventional and not in accordance with the standards gradually evolved over almost a half century of organized effort through accepted academic channels, it does not attempt to secure the approval of the North Central Association, or the Association of American Universities, or of other similar agencies. It goes ahead in the face of formally expressed disapproval of such agencies. It is a law unto itself. I hope it may not be characterized as an academic outlaw or as promoting educational anarchy.

We all believe in the principle, I am sure, of reasonable academic freedom. There is a line, however, not very difficult to discern, between freedom and unlimited license. I have perfect freedom to double up my fist whenever I wish. But that freedom ceases very close to the end of your nose. I have freedom to put my hand in my own pocket whenever I wish. That freedom ceases, however, or is severely restricted, when I put my hand in your pocket and remove without your permission your purse, or your bachelor's degree, or other valuable property.

Again, the Chicago proposal is unfortunate not only in *method* but in *time*. We are now engulfed in the greatest world cataclysm that this old world has ever known. We are struggling for our very lives—and for the perpetuation of our free institutions, including our colleges, with their right to confer any degrees at all.

The first week in January, 1942, there convened in Baltimore a meeting which was characterized by Dr. George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, as "no doubt the largest and most comprehensive gathering of university and college executives ever held in this country." Representatives were present from 46 states, Puerto Rico, and the Dominion of Canada. Several days were spent in full and frank discussion of the way the resources of higher education could best be placed at the service of the nation in the terrible crisis we now face. Much time was spent in consideration of ways to accelerate the processes of higher education so that students might, if possible, complete their college courses before going into service. Many plans were proposed, debated, submitted to groups and committees. Unity in essentials was felt to be im-

portant but latitude in working details desirable. As far as I can find, however, when a wide variety of plans was being thrown into the hopper for democratic consideration, no suggestion was made by the University of Chicago of this plan to change completely the accepted concept of the bachelor's degree. I have already outlined the important results of the Baltimore conference in terms of types of acceleration approved. The bachelor's degree at the sophomore level was not one of these. Yet within less than three weeks after the adjournment of the Baltimore conference, with its fundamental unity on major issues, the announcement was made from Chicago of the plan to change completely the significance of the bachelor's degree—acceleration with a vengeance!

Perhaps the American Association of University Women was justified in its recently published statement on the subject, referring to the Chicago proposal, with characteristic feminine intuition, as "a Pearl Harbor attack on the bachelor's degree," and "as tending to cause confusion in academic terms and to debase the value of the bachelor's degree." They evidently noted the uncomfortably close parallelism. While Japan's envoys were carrying on their discussions in Washington in a presumably amicable effort to reconcile points of difference between friendly nations, others on the shores of the Pacific were plotting their attack on that friendly nation at Pearl Harbor. While the educational leaders of the nation were carrying on their discussions in Baltimore in an amicable effort to reconcile points of difference, were others on the shores of Lake Michigan plotting an attack on the bachelor's degree? I hope not. I do not answer the question. I only ask it. It would not be difficult to characterize the Chicago proposals, under wartime conditions, as bordering on the unpatriotic, if not a harsher term, since they certainly tend to cause educational disunity at a time when unity, harmony, and cooperation are essential as never before in all areas of higher education. Do you wonder that a loyal Chicago alumnus feels sad and depressed when he realizes what his alma mater has done? Even if there were merit in the Chicago proposal for the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level, should it not have been postponed for sane and peaceful consideration after the war is over?



## V

I have now discussed, as far as time permits, my three major propositions, that the Chicago plan for the bachelor's degree in my judgment is undesirable, unnecessary, and particularly unfortunate both in the manner of its proposal and in the time of its proposal under wartime conditions. May I now consider a little more specifically a few of the recent statements made by President Hutchins?

President Hutchins says:

A bachelor's degree for general education has important implications to the 600 junior colleges of the country. They are now in an anomalous position, despite the fact that they are the fastest growing section of our educational system. In a few instances, such as Pasadena, they are integrated into a 6-4-4 plan, and so are organized to be effective.<sup>1</sup>

The dictionary defines "anomalous" as "deviating from the common rule." It is a little difficult to understand how all 600 junior colleges can "deviate from the common rule." President Hutchins refers to Pasadena. This is one of the oldest and best examples of the 6-4-4 plan in the United States.<sup>2</sup> Its president is John W. Harbeson, who is also president of the American Association of Junior Colleges and a very good friend of mine, although he and I have not always agreed on matters of junior college philosophy. Let me quote a few sentences from an address he made before the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools at their last annual meeting in Salt Lake City:

When the junior college was first discussed, there was much debate on which was better, the two-year junior college or the four-year junior college. A good many of us who were working and

<sup>1</sup> In the numerous quotations from President Hutchins in this section no effort is made to document each one. All have been taken from official statements from the University in which he is quoted directly, or from recent signed articles by him in the *New York Times* and other periodicals.

<sup>2</sup> A plan for organization of the public school system consisting of six years of elementary school and eight years of secondary schools—a lower secondary unit of four years called the high school and an upper secondary unit of four years called the college or the junior college. About a dozen such organizations were in existence in 1940, of which the best known was at Pasadena, California.

pioneering in the four-year unit were pugnacious in attempting to defend our side; and the strange thing seemed to be that all of us had an idea that it was a question of either it was going to be one or it was going to be the other; until someone discovered the astute idea that maybe the world was big enough for both, and it became very evident that, when you study the junior college situation in different localities, you cannot escape the conclusion that there are situations in which the two-year unit is certainly the better unit: it meets the conditions . . . . I think that those of us who in the early days condemned the two-year unit take the position that there are places where it is the desirable form.

I respectfully suggest that some university presidents might well profit from Dr. Harbeson's example, become less "pugnacious" in condemning *in toto* the two-year junior college, and reach the "astute idea" that "there are situations in which the two-year unit is certainly the better."

I deplore greatly, however, the effort to tie up together the question of the 6-4-4 plan and the bachelor's degree. The two matters are not at all necessarily and integrally related. We need only note that Pasadena, the largest junior college in the country on the 6-4-4 basis, has been giving the Associate in Arts for almost a decade. One can advocate vigorously the 6-4-4 plan with the associate's degree, or with the bachelor's degree, or with no degree. One can advocate equally vigorously the two-year plan with the associate's degree, or with the bachelor's degree, or with no degree. Presumably we are now discussing primarily the proposal to award the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level, with normally 14 years of formal education preceding it, regardless of the particular way those 14 years are divided into administrative units. I must insist as strongly as I know how that it is not necessary to discuss the merits of the 6-4-4 plan in order to discuss the desirability of the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level. I am quite willing to argue the 6-4-4 plan in detail if necessary, but not tonight. I devoted four long chapters to it in my book, *The Junior College*, 12 years ago, and have seen little or no reason to alter the essential arguments there presented. I am quite willing and ready to admit, however, that the matter of exact number of years in each unit of the administrative organization of the junior college is not as vitally important as it seemed to me 12 years ago. I should like to



be registered as agreeing with Dr. Harbeson that there is a significant place for both types. I hope President Hutchins will join us in this view.

President Hutchins has repeatedly referred to William Rainey Harper and Nicholas Murray Butler as favoring the new Chicago plan, but has not quoted them directly as far as I know. Regarding President Butler he says:

The proposals I have made for the reorganization of education are not new. President Butler of Columbia made them 40 years ago. Nobody could find anything against them then. Nobody can find anything against them now.

Please bear in mind that President Hutchins' "proposals for the reorganization of education" are very specifically for a four-year unit followed at the sophomore level by the bachelor's degree.

It is quite true that about 1900 President Butler made various tentative suggestions to the trustees for a shortened college course and also suggested possible alternatives for an appropriate symbol of completion, one of which was the bachelor's, another of which was the associate's. Neither he nor anyone else had ever heard of the 6-4-4 plan in 1900. His suggestions were debated by various prominent university presidents of that period, culminating in a formal discussion at a meeting of the National Education Association three years later in 1903. President Butler's statement at this time presumably represented his latest and most matured thinking on the question. He said:

There should be a college course, two years in length, carefully constructed as a thing in itself. Whether the completion of such a two-year college course should be crowned with a degree is to me a matter of indifference.<sup>1</sup>

This does not seem to be very vigorous support either for the four-year unit advocated by President Hutchins or for the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level. It certainly does not support President Hutchins' proposals with reference to the junior college movement, since there was only one small public junior college in

<sup>1</sup> *Educational Review*, Vol. 26, pp. 144-45, September, 1903.

existence, here in Illinois, and that one only one year old! Since that time there has occurred the marvelous growth of the junior college movement to more than 600 institutions, with 267,000 students—"the most wholesome and significant occurrence in American education in the present century," to quote a prominent university president. The separate "college course, two years in length, carefully constructed as a thing in itself" advocated by President Butler 40 years ago, has come about in 600 junior colleges in a way he certainly did not foresee at that time. Nor have we noted any recent proposals coming from Columbia University to give the bachelor's degree at the sophomore level.

President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University also participated in this discussion. He said:

I urge that the universities should maintain each its present standard for the degree of bachelor of arts.

In the same discussion President Harper devoted practically his whole address, arranged with his characteristic clarity of expression and modesty, to:

... considerations which appear to me to be distinctly opposed to the proposition to make three years the normal period of residence for the college course, instead of four.

In conclusion, he said:

I would suggest that the plan which has been in operation at the University of Chicago for nearly 10 years has seemed to many of us to meet in large measure the demands called for this morning. This plan provides a course of four years and a course of two years . . . . The provision of a two-year course meets the needs of many who cannot take a longer term of residence and likewise of many who ought not to take a longer course. The provision of a normal four-year course meets the needs of the average man or woman. This plan does not imply that this average man or woman is particularly stupid nor that a year has been wasted. With the completion of the two-year course, a certificate is given, granting the title of Associate in the university.

Is not President Harper's doctrine equally good today? When President Hutchins refers to Dr. Harper as originating the movement culminating in the present proposals, why does he not quote such statements as the above with reference to the associate's degree from his distinguished predecessor in the presidency?

Again, President Hutchins says: "85 per cent of the public junior colleges are in high school buildings." He has made this statement repeatedly, implying, of course, that the junior college for the most part is thus inevitably tied up anyway with the high school and should be united with it in the curricular organization as well. May I take the occasion to correct this unfortunate numerical inaccuracy? Reports from 226 public junior colleges published in our reference book, *American Junior Colleges*, two years ago show that less than 60% share their plant in any way with the local high school, and many of these share it in only a minor degree, such as use of auditorium, gymnasium, or home economics department. It is the very small junior college, still in the pioneering stages, which for the most part is temporarily housed in the high school plant. In institutions which do not share high school plants the average enrollment of regular students is more than 800; in those that do, it is only a little more than 200.

President Hutchins makes some rather sweeping and uncomplicated generalizations concerning the junior college movement at the present time. May I quote a few?

It "faces an impossible task." It has "failed to work out an intelligible course of study." The junior colleges are "multiplying like jackrabbits," but they "have yet to discover their function in the educational system or how they can perform it." "They have had a disturbing not to say distorting effect on the colleges of liberal arts and the universities." "In the long period of depression they have served a highly useful purpose in keeping young people out of worse places until they could get jobs," but nevertheless "the junior colleges now are a misfit wrecking the educational system."

I shall not attempt to answer such charges in detail. I do not think an answer is needed. But I should like to set beside these strikingly sweeping pronouncements concerning the junior college movement President Hutchins' opening sentences in an address

before the American Association of Junior Colleges here in Chicago a year ago. He said:

As you know, I have no expert, first-hand knowledge of the junior colleges of the United States. I cannot justify my presumption in making suggestions to this group by claiming that I have.

Lack of time prevents me from considering in detail some of the other unfortunate generalizations which have been made by President Hutchins in this connection. I return, therefore, to summarize and conclude my main line of argument. I have presented three major arguments: (1) that the University of Chicago proposal regarding the bachelor's degree is *undesirable*, because other institutions have long-established and widely recognized prior proprietary rights and because hopeless academic confusion and hairpulling would result; (2) that it is *unnecessary* because every legitimate need for a college degree at the sophomore level can be met by the existing and increasingly common and popular associate's degree, which has none of the objections inherent in this unauthorized attempt to appropriate the bachelor's degree from its present owners; and (3) that it is *unfortunate*, not only in method of proposal without regard to existing educational agencies and organizations, but also particularly unfortunate, perhaps unpatriotic, in its proposal in time of war, tending to lead to educational disunity when unity is more important than ever before.

I shall only add, therefore, the highly significant statement recently approved by the official boards of the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, the Association of Colleges and Universities of the Pacific Southwest, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the National Association of State Universities.<sup>1</sup> I do not see how a single phrase of it could be improved as a brief but comprehensive statement of desirable policy for the future. It reads as follows:

<sup>1</sup> This statement was also approved unanimously by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in session at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 26, 1942.

The four-year liberal arts college and the two-year junior college are distinctive and unique products of the American system of higher education. They have no exact counterpart in other countries. Increasingly in hundreds of these colleges, over a long period of years, the bachelor's degree has come to stand for the successful completion of four years of collegiate education beyond the secondary school; the associate's degree or title for the successful completion of two years of collegiate education beyond the secondary school—whether secured in the lower division of a university, in a liberal arts college, or in a separately organized junior college.

It is desirable that there be reasonable uniformity in the award of these college degrees in order to avoid confusion on the part of the educational world and of the general public. Any proposal, particularly under wartime conditions, to award the widely recognized bachelor's degree at the close of the junior college or of the sophomore year after only two years or less of college beyond the secondary school is to be deplored. Such practice is sure to lead to widespread misunderstanding and confusion and to result in cheapening the significance of the time-honored and universally recognized baccalaureate degree. The baccalaureate degree should continue to signify the completion of the equivalent of a four-year collegiate course of study; the associate's degree, the completion of the equivalent of a two-year collegiate course of study.

## MISSIONARIES IN REVERSE

By ROBERT WITHINGTON

Smith College

We usually attach to the word *missionary* an idea of someone sent abroad to give, rather than to get; he may represent the church, or a business-house, or he may be a propagandist who circulates ideas, some of which may be prejudiced. He is not necessarily an agent to promote good-feeling between nations, though he is often concerned with improving the lot of the peoples to whom he is sent. We sometimes regard exchange students and professors as missionaries; too frequently they interpret their own civilization, instead of learning from the lands they visit.

In these troubled times, the question of international exchange of students demands careful examination. Fellowships have been designed to bring about the good feeling between nations which idealists find at the foundation of perpetual peace. Where friendship exists, self-interest seems petty; selfishness and sympathy are mutually exclusive. For many years we have had exchange students and professors—an exchange of the *intelligentsia*, in short—between political and cultural entities, and we might have hoped that this exchange would result in a lasting peace. Had the conduct of governmental affairs been in the hands of academicians, the Second World War would probably not have broken out. Unfortunately neither Hitler nor Mussolini has grasped the nonpolitical point of view of the scholar.

### II

But one wonders if the students who, in the past, have enjoyed the opportunity of study abroad have always been alive to their privilege. The *intelligentsia* is a group often confused, on the part of the uninformed, with the intelligent; and perhaps we should give the word the hard g of the German, that the confusion may not be the more marked. It has been assumed, perhaps



tacitly, by those who have charge of our educational system that a thorough acquaintance of the young people of two countries will produce an international amity and understanding and make war impossible. This was the idea behind the royal marriages of an earlier age, which were, apparently, no more productive of peace. When Elizabeth went from Bavaria to Belgium as the spouse of King Albert, she espoused also her adopted country; and when war broke out in 1914 (unhindered by the marriage), she threw her lot with her husband and his people. But this did not keep the Bavarians out of the struggle. Had a group of Bavarian students visited Belgian universities before the present war, they would probably have been regarded, not as agents of peace, but rather as "fifth columnists," preparing for the new hostilities; and it is one of the dangers of the exchange fellowships which, even now, we are eager to establish, that such implications are lost upon our educators. Another danger is that, even when a "fifth column" is not a possibility, it does not occur to our idealists that a thorough knowledge of a foreign country is as likely to engender hatred as sympathy on the part of our exchange students; that international good feeling can never be artificially produced—by a kind of parthenogenesis; that such international good feeling as may grow from memories of hospitality is not necessarily lasting, or well-founded. The ground for the planting of international good will must be as carefully prepared as the ground for any other kind of crop.

### III

Things being as they are in Europe and Asia, the only foreign soils open to our students seem to be Central and South America. With a fairly sound equipment of Spanish or Portuguese, our exchange fellows sail south. Before they sail there are instructions which should be given them. In the first place, they should be told that they will do no good as Ambassadors Ordinary (which they perforce become) so long as they give the impression that they have nothing to learn. They must not assume (and act on the assumption) that they are doing the foreigners a kindness by associating with them. They should profit by the mistakes made

by the representatives of other nations. While the English have many virtues which the Germans do not always exhibit, the two peoples share some of the same shortcomings: one is the sense of superiority which neither hesitates to express, in one way or another, to people of other lands. Both seem inclined to regard their own "culture" as superior to ours, and we feel towards them as a recent autobiographer felt towards a distinguished American educator: that while he was a man of unquestionable distinction he had a no less unquestionable conviction of his own infallibility. It would be unfortunate if our students felt that our "culture" is superior to that of South Americans, or gave the impression that this was their feeling. If so, their efforts might give rise to a feeling of superiority or inferiority on the part of the South American, in which case the money spent in sending our students south would have been wasted.

If it is not too much to ask that our student ambassadors should adopt the attitude of humility (which is not apology) shown by a late Archbishop of Canterbury, who told an American audience that he came here to learn, we might make other suggestions to them. They are headed for South America not to meet compatriots, but to mingle with the inhabitants of the country where they are to study. We may assume that before they have been selected, they have shown a certain proficiency in the language they are to speak; we may hope that they have sense enough not to preach the advantages of the "American way" or to criticize the Bolivian or Peruvian who does not see life through the lenses of a resident of Fort Wayne or Hollywood. They are to bring back to us manners and customs which can add to our civilization; to do this they must observe what is better there than here, and not spend their energies in spreading our "culture" abroad. In other words, let them behave as they would have the South American student behave in the United States; let them leave the propagation of our civilization in the southern hemisphere to the visiting South Americans. It is (in this case) more blessed to receive than to give—and more effective.

Just as there is no "Baptist mathematics" or "Presbyterian geometry," so there is no "Argentinian chemistry" or "Uruguyan physics." Science and letters and philosophy know no inter-

national boundaries—and while methods of laboratory and library and lecture-room may differ, it is not for students to argue relative superiority. Our American student must adapt himself to the habits of the country in which he is living; and this holds as much with the commercial traveller who wants to do business with the South Americans as it does with the student who plans to become a "live wire" of international amity. If either should boast that his civilization is superior, his attitude would inevitably arouse distrust—or even contempt—in those whom he may meet. When such students return, they are more likely to be centers of light (if not of sweetness) than if they had spent their time in belittling the way of life of others, or exalting our own.

It must be plain that those of our magazine publishers who prepare editions for South American readers, or those of our cinema producers who manufacture pictures for South American spectators, would lose more, were they to delete everything which indicates that we are less than perfect, than they would gain by dressing up our civilization in a perfection which it does not deserve, and cannot justly assume. Our neighbors would respect us more—knowing that we share the weaknesses of humanity (as well as its glories), and learning this from our own lips—than if we pretended that we were superhuman, admitted no frailties, or claimed the superiority to which none has a right. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; and if the "meek" means the "teachable," the lesson is peculiarly applicable to exchange students. It is, of course, clear that editors and producers cannot absorb foreign culture; they must reflect and distribute ours; but they need not assume superiority.

When we talk about "good neighbors"—as when we talk about "morale"—there is a suspicion that we have not got them, though we may want them. Have the South American countries called us a "good neighbor"? Are they concerned with winning our sympathy, or do they bargain with us? The good neighbor both gives and gets—whether on a suburban street or on contiguous continents; and when we have a good neighbor, we do not tell him about our policy of developing good neighbors. We do not ask our neighbors to give all—and surely they are not good, if they take all. What makes a good neighbor is, in the last analysis,

cooperation; and this we may expect to find in the students we send abroad and in those we receive from away. And if we find friendliness, the cooperation takes care of itself. Where book-keeping enters the picture—economic or moral—friendship flies out; he who would save his soul shall lose it.

#### IV

The responsibility of those who choose the successful candidates for exchange fellowships is great, and we may wonder if they are always alive to its importance. It is easy to say that the choice of students for these opportunities is a gamble; but some candidates are more promising than others. The chances of producing international good feeling are much better if the exchange is made between mature students—or even teachers—than between fledglings. Marks in courses are not infallible guides; more can often be discovered in a half-hour conversation than in an infinite number of bluebooks and theses. Personality is as important as are grades; a good student with enthusiasm and sympathy is a better ambassador than a keener scholar who becomes a recluse. What interpretation of his own land he is bound to give, is given unconsciously; as people like him, they instinctively like his country; and they like him as he likes them.

The travelling scholar of the Middle Ages wandered through Europe for his own good, but he spread civilization as he went, carrying ideas from one place to another, without any *arrière-pensée*. Missionaries our present-day students may become, but they ought to have nothing of the propagandist in them. Nor, of course, can they show interest in such details as would arouse suspicions of "fifth-column" activity. If we can ever speak of American "solidarity" as anything but an idealist's dream, we must achieve it slowly and naturally by an exchange of culture carried on by travellers who do not aim at it. Just as Alice reached the hill only by walking in the other direction, so we can develop a real international friendship only by aiming at something else: the study of science, letters, philosophy, or music, for instance. With an exchange of culture, the countries involved will soon discover that mutual interests have produced a common liking, more en-

during and more fundamental than a surface politeness—courteous, perhaps, but possibly also suspicious—which can hardly be called friendship. Better no exchange at all than one which breeds distrust, or artificial sentiments which cannot withstand the strain of a war-torn age.

## V

As we should not try to hide our imperfections from our neighbors, so we should not expect to find them faultless, or condemn them for not being superhuman. Let our exchange students make up their minds, before they leave home, that they will not discover perfection during their stay abroad. But let them also realize that they will find much to admire and something to copy before they return. They go as students, not as moralists—surely not as Pharisees; they are not holier than their hosts, and (we trust) will not thank God that they are not as other men. They will learn much; and could their scholarly attitude of mind be produced in all travellers, there would soon be no war. It is only when selfishness and greed (which make men dishonest, and lead them to ignore their pledges) speak the language of force that battles begin; and as humanity is knit closer together, wars become fratricidal struggles, akin to civil strife. The true scholar gets, only that he may give; his service is disinterested, and his broad outlook militates against dogmatism. He is ready to admit his errors, and anxious to help his fellows, without thought of personal reward. The young scholar has much to learn by studies in a foreign land; but his chief lessons are given and received when he is least conscious of them. Only when one is aware of the dangers lurking in international exchanges can he become alive to the benefits of a sojourn abroad; his responsibilities are constant—like the vigilance which guards liberty—and his power is great. It can be used for good, or ill; and history may show the effects thereof.

## CHINA AND THE DEMOCRATIC WAY<sup>1</sup>

By ARTHUR W. HUMMEL

Library of Congress

We have often been told that the Chinese in their present epic struggle are fighting the battle of the democracies. Though most Americans concur in this statement they are not likely to agree on the sense in which it is to be understood or what qualifications, if any, are necessary. What has this ancient, loosely organized state in common with us? What values in their culture are they fighting to preserve, which at the same time are relevant to us? Are there substantial grounds for mutual understanding that we ought to cultivate? In so far as we are failing in this how can we rectify our mistakes?

To answer these questions we must go back if we can to the basic concepts on which a democratic society rests. If we think of democracy, as we so often do, in terms of a system of government or a political technique we are thinking of the means and not of the ends. These means, these techniques, the Chinese will doubtless in due time invent or acquire. When we apply the word democracy to them we must ask about the kind of personality they hope to create, the truths about man they have been passionately concerned to defend. We must consider, in other words, their views of the worth and dignity of man, their modes of personal intercourse, and the kind of society they wish to establish.

The dominant ideas that have determined the nature of Chinese civilization through the years were formulated in a period of great social and political turmoil between the 6th and 3d centuries B.C. Not one but many ethical and political philosophers set forth their views at that time, and all sought public and official approval. Virtually every social point of view that Western thinkers have entertained since the days of Plato and Aristotle had some pro-

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from *The American Scholar*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Spring, 1942.



tagonists in China during that early period or some interpreter in later centuries. By the Confucianists the individual was urged to dedicate himself to great social ends, beginning with the family and reaching out to the world; and by the Taoists he was advised to walk in Nature's Way and "just amuse himself with the variety of opinions and not quarrel with them." To balance and evaluate these and other rival claims a high degree of tolerance and mental flexibility was required of the thinkers and teachers of that day. Likewise every man who later read or heard of their views or who tried to put them into practice had to exercise some of this same tolerance, this same interpretative skill.

One of the problems engrossing thinkers at that time, particularly the philosopher Mencius, was the right to revolt against the established government. Once, while discussing an episode in history, he was asked whether a minister might ever put his sovereign to death. He replied, in language which necessarily had to be evasive if the question were to be answered at all, that the king referred to had outraged benevolence and righteousness and that when he was put to death it was "a robber and a ruffian" and not a ruler who had died. "The people," said Mencius on another occasion, "are the most important element in a nation; the spirits of the land and grain are next; the sovereign is the lightest." Mencius and his contemporaries were saying, through the medium of these and many other remarks of a similar tenor, that the ruler is the servant and not the master of the people. This thought—that the people are strong and the sovereign is weak—the Chinese have often liked to express in the quaint words of their ancient chronicle, the *Tso-chuan*, "The tail is large and cannot be wagged."

The surprising thing is that these revolutionary utterances and many like them could survive through more than twenty centuries of monarchical rule, and that the classics containing them should have been used in the competitive civil service examinations for the selection of government officials. There were protests in high places, of course—as when the first Ming emperor (himself oddly enough a commoner) in 1394 ordered an edition of the *Book of Mencius* with 85 "extravagant statements" expunged. But the climate of thought was against him, his text gained no credence, and students were soon examined, as before, on the entire work.

## II

Just as democracy in the West received its great impetus from the Christian conception of personality, so Chinese society—always intent on discovering ways to help men get along together—was animated by great precepts concerning the dignity and worth of man, precepts their most fearless thinkers enunciated in the early years of their history. These thinkers were anxious on the one hand to neutralize and render inert the autocratic power of their rulers, and on the other to preserve what order and justice they could in a feudal system then visibly dissolving in violence and bloodshed. Their aim was to develop a society of self-respecting, self-directing, and self-acting men who though owing allegiance to their rulers would ask very little of them and in every essential matter would be their own masters. "You can rob an army of its general," said Confucius, "but you cannot rob even a common man of his will." The truly great man, said Mencius, is one who "is unswayed by the power of riches and honor, who accepts poverty and a humble lot without swerving from principle, and who refuses to bend to the menace of power and force." Mo Ti, advocate in the 4th century B.C. of universal love "without partiality," argued that to test the utility or worth of anything one should appeal "to the sense of hearing and seeing of the common people."

Following the collapse of feudalism in 255 B.C. China was schooled in some fifty years of totalitarian control, comparable in ruthlessness to what she and the ravaged nations of Europe are experiencing today. Under this régime China was, it is true, for the first time unified, but the harshness of the methods employed left an indelible impression on the people's memory. Every normal interest was subordinated to the state or to military necessity. Government by deception, by espionage, and by expediency was openly and shamelessly advocated. Talented men, priding themselves on their "realism," abused their talents to write learned treatises on how to govern along these lines. Their disquisitions have survived through the centuries, thus affording students a long time to read, to digest, and to remember them.

With the rise of a new and less oppressive dynasty, the Han, in

206 B.C. scholars with Confucian leanings made their way into positions of responsibility. Histories and the classics, which had been banned, were taken from their places of hiding and officially designated for study. The great sayings testifying to the primacy of human values and to the worth of a life based on good faith and reason became commonplaces of thought, though their meanings were at times distorted and their teachings were by no means always observed. The people were still subject to the caprice inherent in government by men rather than by law; nevertheless from this time onward they had powerful literary and social sanctions by which they could neutralize oppressive power and maintain a high degree of self-respect.

Beginning in the year 165 A.D. knowledge of the classics was required for selection to government offices. After the 6th century, moreover, civil service examinations were open to all competitors alike. From that time on, except for a few decades under Mongol rule in the 13th century, the son of the humblest artisan or farmer could, and did, rise to the highest posts in the empire. This continued to be true until 1905 when examinations gave place to modernized schools. Owing in part to the competitive system, class distinctions were almost entirely erased and the whole social structure of society was democratized. Since the highest offices were thus continually filled from below, there was no room for a self-perpetuating aristocracy. The changes brought about in Chinese life—more fundamental than popular writers have led us to believe—could not be imposed from above; they could be effected only with the consent of the people as a whole. Fully alive to this fact, Chinese magistrates, in posting their decrees, took pains to give the reasons for their observance. They were dealing with a people who could be persuaded but could not easily be regimented.

There runs through Chinese thinking a high degree of common sense and sanity, a strain of rational skepticism which has often saved them from the hazards of blind credulity on the one hand and from irrational excesses on the other. This is not the skepticism that ends in irresolution; it is the mentality that is wary of dogma and cannot long be deceived by magic or superstition or philosophies alien to a naturalistic tradition. After a long, futile

attempt to comprehend the subtleties of Buddhist metaphysics, the Chinese dispensed with one mystery after another until—in the Ch'an (Zen) sect at least—the believer was left with little more than his native intelligence, his own inner light. Those features in Buddhist philosophy that seemed to the scholars to fill a deep human need they finally professed to find, in essence at least, in their own classical texts.

The respect accorded this skepticism, its firmly established position, were brought to notice recently by His Excellency, the Chinese Ambassador, Dr. Hu Shih, when he placed some family papers on temporary deposit in the Library of Congress—in particular certain notebooks kept by his father as a student in the Lung Mên Academy, Shanghai, late in the 1850's. The thing that most impressed the Ambassador about these books—which had been handed out in blank form to all the students in the Academy—was the motto the authorities had printed at the top of each page. There, where no student could fail to see them, were the words:

Your first task in studying anything is to approach the subject in a spirit of doubt; and your next is to find out for yourself what the meaning is. The great teacher, Chang Tsai (1020-1077 A.D.), used to say, "If you can doubt at points where other people feel no impulse to doubt, then you are making progress." He also said, "As your mind is thus opened to new truth, it is well to put the facts at once on paper; for unless you meditate on them, your mind will get clogged up again."

A people with such a tradition will not be blinkered by the bogey of "dangerous thoughts" or by race myths inimical to the peace of the world. The Chinese are not unacquainted with religious persecution; they have had emperors who placed certain types of literature under the ban; and they have had leaders who for political ends favored narrow and unfruitful interpretations of the classics. But their essentially liberal tradition has never been wholly extinguished. After the Han period, at least, the government maintained a body of censors whose business it was to report on anything wrong in governmental administration and to criticize

officials, including the emperor. Though these censors were on occasion persecuted for their plain-spoken utterances they were highly respected and were ordinarily given a free rein. In the field of scholarship the adherents of the different philosophical schools freely criticized one another. Literary critics, moreover, could discuss without hindrance the spuriousness of highly venerated texts. In the past half century this free criticism has extended to every phase of the national heritage—no belief, no custom, and no institution was so sacred as to be exempt. If enlightened skepticism is essential in a people who wish to maintain their liberties, the Chinese may be said to have it.

### III

It is one of the characteristics of a democratic society that though it can strive for great ends it must always disclaim any ability to formulate an ultimate truth. To function democratically it must assume it is not yet democratic enough, that there is still more to achieve. If at any time it supposes itself to have discovered a finality, at that very moment inertia has set in—the people can relinquish their responsibility and the dictator can have his way. Because the Chinese have so little faith in ultimate views they did not take to the pan-Asian dream of recent years. For the same reason they silently permitted one misguided warlord after another to pass into oblivion. They needed the cohesion and patriotism that commitment to a shining goal would have given them, but they were also spared the frustration following nonattainment and, worse still, the cynicism and disillusionment which paralyze useful activity. Though they accept the fact that absolute knowledge is unattainable in a world of uncertainty, this in no way prevents them from committing themselves to ideal objectives or from finding enjoyment in the pursuit. They hold that there is sufficient good to be found in the activity itself and that success or failure can be left to fate. Perhaps the highest tribute ever paid to Confucius by a contemporary was the assertion that "though he knew he could not succeed, he still kept on trying."

The Chinese doubtless have their own fixed ideas but they

manage rather successfully to conceal them, giving the impression of a people more concerned to search for the truth than to claim possession of it. Searching for the truth, or the right way, in human relations obviously means thinking of people as being in relation. "The west side of my house is the east side of my neighbor's house," said the 18th-century historian, Ts'ui Shu, quoting a proverb current in his day. It was a truth enunciated by the Taoists many centuries earlier. Insight and skill in human affairs is analogous to the skill we use daily in the right interpretation of music and art and poetry. The same quick understanding, the same tactful handling of involved relations is required in both. A too strict application of a principle in human relations, a failure to take into account the special circumstances modifying a given case, is like the attempt to interpret the meaning of a word apart from its context.

"All life comes back," said Henry James, "to the question of our relations with one another." Because the Chinese have always believed this to be true, the study of their culture becomes in large part the study of a way of life. They have by no means mastered the art of living but they have certainly spent more time and thought on it than any other people. Nearly all their classics and novels made it their primary concern; even their histories professed to teach, or were believed by their readers to teach, some moral lesson. The common people have such a rich store of proverbs in this field that many a Westerner acquainted with Chinese thought, when he feels the need for a really pertinent maxim, reaches out for an old Chinese aphorism because, like the multiplication table, it seems to go back to first principles. Pre-occupied as they were with human problems, the Chinese took comparatively little interest in any purely intellectual quest or in the arrival at abstract truth by a set of logical propositions. They paid rather dearly for this, to be sure, in the tardy development of the physical and applied sciences; but they gained a heightened awareness in other fields which, for the future of mankind, may be equally important.

A disciple of Confucius summed up the Master's teachings in two words signifying *loyalty* to self and *mutuality* in dealing with others. When he was asked whether his teachings might be ex-



pressed in one word he replied, "Surely the word *mutuality* is such." "Be inwardly square, but outwardly round," says the proverb; hold fast, if you wish, to the long aim but in carrying it out present as few sharp corners as possible. "In everything let there be standing room"—make it possible for the offender to keep his self-respect and resume his place in society. "Don't injure friendly feelings face to face"—there is a duty not only to tell the truth but to make it palatable. Don't press matters to a final brutal conclusion; disregard trifles and yield to the prejudices of others. Don't put yourself in the wrong through impatience and contempt. "He who has reason on his side need not speak in a loud voice"—a proverb much admired by Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary to China.

There are obvious dangers in some of these counsels for, like all delicately poised things, they can be pushed to extremes. This the Chinese have on occasion done. But finalities have their dangers, too, for behind every finality there lurks an assumption of omniscience, a claim easily perverted into a bid for unrestricted control. The Chinese have had ample occasion to observe in their own history, and in the sufferings they are now enduring, the calamities a people with "divine missions" and "immutable policies" can inflict on the world. They have demonstrated that a people holding their humane views can also rise, when necessary, to the defense of these views.

Curiously enough we can expect but little help from the Chinese in making these concepts known in the West. They regard them as axiomatic and therefore see no reason to argue for them. It is both the strength and the weakness of their position that they take little interest in propagandizing, even for their own cause. Rightly or wrongly, they believe that each of the world's cultural groups will get on best if it lets the other choose what it wants. Acting on the assumption that "a good drum does not need a heavy stick" they are more concerned to understand others than to change them—a thought which Confucius expressed in the words, "I do not grieve that men do not know me; I will grieve that I do not know men."

We can go a long way toward an understanding of the Chinese way of life if we dismiss from our thoughts any remaining traces of

the obfuscating notion that the people are in some degree enigmatical or inscrutable. This is to create bogeys where none exist. "It is easy to paint a goblin," said the 17th-century philosopher, Yen Yüan, "but it is hard to paint a horse." In the world of goblins, one man's picture is as good as another's; but in the world of real things, fidelity to fact is important. In truth, we see in China a people with whom we have more in common than with some nations of Europe or even of South America. We live in analogous great geographical areas on opposite sides of the world; we have much the same plant life from which we can both draw to our mutual advantage; we have similar practicality, a similar sense of humor, and a like passionate faith in education; finally, we have in common our socially democratic ways.

#### IV

The world situation demands of us that some of the adjustments which the Chinese, and other nations of Eastern Asia, have had to make—with many misgivings and some loss of pride—we too must make. "You can build a cart indoors," says the Chinese proverb, "but when you take it out on the road it will have to follow the ruts." We surely cannot proceed on the assumption that all the important adjustments will be made by others and that we need make only the minor ones; or that the Orientals will one day all speak our language and think our thoughts and that we shall then not need to trouble about theirs. They are, indeed, learning our language—English has long been taught in all the lower and higher schools of the East and many Chinese who have never been out of their country speak it with great ease. They thus have the keys to unlock two cultures, their own and ours; they have facilities for making comparisons which we, limited to one tradition, do not possess. Some twenty centuries ago the Chinese strategist, Sun-tzŭ, uttered a warning still applicable to any one who can view such a state of affairs with complacency. "If you know both yourself and your opponent you need not fear defeat in a hundred encounters; if you know only yourself but not your opponent you will lose once for every time you win; if you know neither yourself nor your opponent you will lose every time."

"Wherever men have lived," said Thoreau, "there is a story to be told." Where, indeed, have one race of men lived together longer or written a better documented story than in China? Yet one can scarcely claim that the history departments of our universities are alive to this fact. They devote a semester or a year to one brief episode of European history whereas they try to crowd the four millennia of China into a course lasting a few weeks. This is what the Chinese call "looking at the leopard through a bamboo tube" and seeing only one spot. We encourage specialists to provide us with ever more detailed guides to the civilizations of the ancient Mediterranean world while we have at our disposal only the most elementary tools for understanding the living cultures of India, China, and Japan. Our students remain largely uninformed about the powerful rejuvenating forces at work in those lands, as reflected in art and literature. Even political events they cannot view discriminatingly because the names of the participants and the cultural background mean so little to them. The Chinese language opens to the reader one of the richest literatures of the world. It is worth studying if for no other reason than that it differs so greatly from the languages we know. Its uninflected, ideographic structure forces the reader to think about language from a wholly new point of view. The same can be said for the study of Chinese art. Here, at last, we have a form of esthetic expression which unlike our own we can approach unhampered by a great weight of tradition to guide our opinion—we don't have to say we like it if we don't. Our critical sense is sharpened; we are able to return to our own art the objects we have been told we ought to like, with a new detachment and freedom.

It is important at this juncture in world affairs to be on guard against what the philosopher, A. N. Whitehead, calls "dogmatism as to patterns of connection." We should not become so conditioned in our scientific observation, in our religious and social outlook, or even in our democratic ways, that we are blind to possible alternatives. We lightly assume that the patterns we have made, or inherited, are part of the nature of things, forgetting that they were constructed by the mind for specific purposes and can be reconstructed to suit broader purposes as these come into view. The emergence on the world's stage of people with other habits

and other points of view is not a menace; it is a positive opportunity. As some of our prophets of doom have done, we can interpret the increasing interpenetration of cultures as pointing to the beginning of the end of Western civilization; or we can see in it the possibility of a richer and more varied life for mankind. Minds flexible enough to make the new comparisons, the new parallels which the interpenetration of cultures makes possible, will not feel they are losing anything in the process. They are confronted by what Shelley termed "a thousand unapprehended combinations." New insights, new perspectives, and new refinements in thought and feeling can be theirs.

## THE ITINERANT INSTRUCTOR

By BERNARD N. SCHILLING

Grinnell College

If the general public think much about those who teach in American colleges and universities, I dare say that they consider life among these people rather easy and charming. The academic world seems happily removed from the brutal competition of business; it is physically set apart on green, manicured campuses with delightful lawns and trees. The fortunate people who teach in these surroundings enjoy long vacations from jobs which do not seem very hard in any case. They are largely untouched by the troubles of the outside world, and, what is most appealing to the troubled citizen of our time, there is an air of security and permanence about the whole thing. One understands that a bright young fellow can go to school for awhile, obtain the necessary credentials, and get a handsome job teaching in a university. This young man will in the course of time advance through certain stages to a position in his young middle age from which he cannot be discharged, in which he gets an adequate if not very large salary which is absolutely dependable, and in which he seems to have nothing whatever to worry about for the rest of his life.

It seems unlikely that anyone in the academic world itself would believe these things, given the enormous difficulties which now beset anyone who wants to teach in a college or university. It may be profitable, none the less, to follow the adventures of a young man who sets out upon an academic career and to study their implications. Indeed, it is precisely because the reader is likely to find this narrative distressingly familiar that it should be formally told. There now exists a threat to the very quality of the academic profession which should be recognized and dealt with vigorously before serious damage is done.

## II

Let me choose for purposes of illustration a young man who wants to teach English. I do this partly because I am especially familiar with what is likely to happen to him in that case, partly because so many teachers wish to teach English and partly because English is something to which everyone, without exception, who has gone to college has been exposed. Actually, it is because all college students are obliged to take English that the young man will get a job at all, and paradoxically it is for the same reason that his professional difficulties will follow in a short time. Thus, every person who has been to college is unknowingly a part of the problem I am about to discuss. The problem is by no means confined to departments of English, but will exist to some extent in any field such as history, foreign languages, or geology, in which an elementary or basic course has to be taken before students can proceed to more advanced work.

I take it for granted that the aspiring young man has a Ph.D degree. He knows that he cannot hope for a career at the college or university level without this degree, so he has worked very hard and has won the distinction on his merits. He is now ready for his first job. This first position is very easily obtained. A very nice person comes to the graduate school one day in late spring, looking for an instructor in English. He is the chairman of a department of English in one of our large middle-western universities and offers our young man a four-year appointment at an initial salary of \$2000 a year. Nearly all such persons who are important in academic affairs are exceedingly amiable and gentle men of good will. The unpleasant things they sometimes have to do stand out the more sharply in contrast, and emphasize the painful irrelevance of their amiability. But at the outset of one's career one is only pleased to deal with such obviously benevolent people, and our young man looks forward keenly to his first experience under very pleasant auspices.

September comes and the young teacher works with enthusiasm. He is assigned to the teaching of Freshman English, the indispensable English A which every student who enters the university is required to take. He works very hard with themes and



conducts his classes with a fresh vigor which the students enjoy. By the end of his first year the young man has every reason to be proud of his success. I emphasize the fact of his competence because he himself imagines that this alone will govern the course of his career. He thinks that life is as it was in the graduate school, where on the whole a man was rewarded according to his merits. He has yet to learn that his professional competence may have nothing to do with what happens to him in his first years as a teacher.

### III

By the end of his second year in English A the successful young teacher feels that he has the work of the course pretty well in hand. He wonders when he will be given a chance to teach some of the courses offered to upperclassmen, courses in which he could work out some of the ideas he had developed in graduate school. He begins also to realize more clearly that he cannot hope for much of a career unless he writes and publishes steadily. He hears on all sides that one's reputation as a teacher is a purely local thing; it is also highly intangible, often a matter of opinion. As one of the older teachers remarked one day, good teaching can be nullified by a lift of the eyebrow, a shrug of the shoulders. But if one writes a book! The volume lies there and cannot be denied; it is incapable evidence of some sort of quality and weighs more heavily than the mere word-of-mouth opinion of one's students. So the young man comes upon one of the bitterest of his first realizations, namely, that the conscientious performance of his actual duties as a teacher may be a disadvantage to him professionally. He tries, therefore, to produce a few articles in his hours of leisure.

The nature of his predicament now begins to dawn upon him. He begins to notice things which he was too busy to worry about before. The department of English contains fifty teachers scattered among five ranks. There are eight or ten Assistants who do part-time teaching while studying for their Ph.D. degrees. Then come the Instructors, about fifteen in number. Nearly half of the department is thus composed of persons who teach nothing but Freshman English and who are given only temporary appoint-

ments. There are eight or ten Assistant Professors, a handful of Associate Professors, and finally a small group of full Professors, older men impregnably fixed in their positions, who control the department and who decide upon its policies. The new Instructor begins to see that, really, the department of English could get on very well without him. There seem to be plenty of persons available to teach all of the advanced courses, one of which he wants to have a share in. He sees now why it was so easy for him to get his first job and why the next step upward in his career is bound to be very difficult, even though he is a very capable person. He sees, in short, the fundamental dilemma in which all large departments of English find themselves. Everyone entering the university has to take Freshman English. Hundreds of new students every year must be taught the beginning course, but only a fraction of these will decide later to take advanced courses. Consequently, an enormous staff must be maintained to teach English A, whereas only a few are needed to deal with the upper division courses.

#### IV

So the young man comes to the fourth and last year of his appointment with a sense of uneasiness about the future. He has worked as hard as anyone could to teach well and to write things which at least show promise. His record is excellent and he feels that if anyone is entitled to a promotion it is he. The nice man who appointed him had said at the outset that there would probably be no promotion, but occasionally room must be made for a good man because, after all, there are a few Assistant Professors who must be promoted at some time or another. So hope arises. Then one day in October of his fourth year, the Instructor finds a letter in his mail box. It is an exceedingly nice letter from the man who had engaged his services. It recalls that this is the last year of his appointment and that unhappily it will not be possible for the department of English to offer him a promotion. There is much congestion in the upper ranks of the department, as everyone knows. No new courses are planned which would provide an opening for another teacher. In short, there is nothing now and

there is not likely in the near future to be anything available which will make it worthwhile for the instructor to remain in the department. Under the circumstances he should plan to find a position elsewhere. The letter ends with a perfectly sincere offer to help him find a new position.

Now the young teacher has known for a long time that this letter was coming, that in fact nothing else could have been said to him under the circumstances. Yet it comes as a blow and he feels persecuted and defrauded. He has done good work; everybody says so. Yet he must leave his position because of certain mechanical obstacles about which no one seems able to do anything. He decides to pay a visit to the head of the department who probably wishes that he could find a place for such a competent person. He admits freely that the young man has been a very good teacher and that there is no question whatever as to his ability.

"Yet we can't any longer make decisions on the basis of a man's merits," he goes on to say. "We want you, for example, very much to stay with us. Yet, what can we possibly offer you? Do you want to be promoted and then go on teaching nothing but English A? Even if you did want such a thing, our budget would never allow it because we should have to raise your salary. We do not like to make 'dry' promotions, and we can get plenty of beginners for much less money to take your job. The new Ph.D.'s are happy to take what we offer at the bottom. The trouble is that we really need men only to teach Freshman English, and you are now progressing into an area in which we have no room for you. But even if we did promote you, what then? We have some Assistant Professors who have been in that rank for ten years or more. We have told nearly all of them that, while they may stay here if they like, they should accept any desirable position that is offered to them elsewhere. We simply have no money now and are not likely to get any more for promotions. So you'd still face a long period without improving your situation. Nearly all Assistant Professors have English A to teach and most of your work would have to be at that level. Actually, you should be glad that we are urging you to continue your career elsewhere." This interview between two men at widely separated levels of academic society is repeated every year in dozens of places all over America.

## V

And so there emerges from the interview a wiser young man. He begins to realize now the significance of what he saw on the bulletin board recently. It was an invitation from a large university to those who want Ph.D. degrees in English, offering assistantships at \$1,000 a year for teaching Freshman English while at the same time doing graduate work. Our young friend has now learned from experience what this means. Room is always great at the bottom. Teachers must annually be attracted into the profession in large numbers, yet there is a permanent place for only a fraction of those who are engaged to teach English A.

The experience of the young teacher whose early career I have been following is a typical example of what happens every year in our larger institutions. What is to become of him? What should his next move be? What can he hope for, on the completion of his first four years as a teacher of English? The answer is that he cannot hope for much more than he has just had, another term of four years or so under the same conditions at some other institution. He is offered nothing but a temporary appointment to teach elementary work. If he decides that he can no longer fight the obstacles to professional advancement, he may turn to the only area of American higher education which is now expanding, the junior college. Here again he would deal largely with Freshman English with the expectation of nothing beyond Sophomore English. He would have no chance to expand into the higher divisions of his profession; he would not be encouraged to go on with his own writing and scholarship, now more removed from his main task of teaching than ever before. His salary would rise to a certain point and then stop once and for all, but he would be removed from the competition of an over-crowded market and he could settle into a useful and interesting life. This is almost all that is left for many young persons whose main interest is teaching, since nearly all colleges and universities demand other evidences of distinction than good teaching, an asset apparently valued only by students. It is one of the many paradoxes which the profession displays that there is little reward offered for competence in teaching.

But I shall assume that this young man is determined to carry on

in the larger professional area; if so, the next four or five years of his career are likely to be very unpleasant. He can probably get another job like the one he has just left. He may, on the other hand, find a place which has adopted a recent scheme for periodic academic house-cleaning. Under this scheme the rank of Assistant Professor is abolished and there are two classes of instructors; those on annual appointments and those engaged for five years. As a rule, young teachers who receive these five-year appointments feel very happy. Not only are they secure for five years in a world where almost nothing lasts that long anyway, but they are given some opportunity to teach at the higher level, to write, and, perhaps, to secure a position of permanence. They know, of course, that nine times out of ten such five-year jobs are just as certain to end with dismissal as the original four-year appointment. Yet the academic profession is now in so desperate a state that a young man may actually consider it a promotion when he moves from a four-year to a five-year instructorship. In any case he must realize that such a promotion is probably the best that he can obtain. Wherever he goes after the first four years, he will have to be looking around for a secure place; careful search and diligent publication may enable him after eight or ten years in the profession to find a good position somewhere. After all, professors do retire now and then, so that the average teacher has some reason to hope, when he is approaching the age of 35, that he will find a place in the academic world such as he had envisaged when he left the graduate school. And if he does find such a position, he really should consider himself lucky, even though he has earned it after years of hard work, insecurity, and frustration.

## VI

I am not sure that any given measure will solve this problem. Several remedies of some usefulness suggest themselves. An instructor might be promoted after his first four years with the understanding that his teaching would be limited to elementary courses. Very few young teachers, however, would be happy if they were denied any hope to teach advanced courses. The academic world is very sensitive to distinctions and opportunities. The instructor

could not be indifferent to something that his colleagues consider important, even assuming that his own energy and ambition would not make him unhappy. Nor are those in authority likely to favor such a proposal. They are sensitive to discontent among their teachers. Moreover, such a plan would cost more money and administrators are likely to be unnerved at the thought of additional expense. For administrators, who think always of the budget, the temporary appointment is a great blessing since it permits the removal of a teacher at the time when his salary would have to be raised if he were retained. It is easier and cheaper to get another beginner. I am sure, therefore, that few would be satisfied with this first proposal.

It has been suggested that some courses might be rotated over a period of years so that the more advanced courses would occasionally be assigned to younger men. Somewhat related to this suggestion is the proposal that, wherever possible, graduate and undergraduate work should be separated. The younger teachers would be given all of the work below the graduate level and their elders would concentrate on graduate courses. This would open up a large area of opportunity for the instructor. These proposals, if adopted, would alleviate somewhat the plight of instructors, but they would not provide a complete remedy. After a certain number of instructors had been retained to teach the rotating courses, the number of new aspirants would once more be greater than the places available for them. The same is true of the proposed division of graduate and undergraduate work; inevitably the command to move on would have to be issued. The latter plan has other disadvantages. Its operation would result in the loss to instructors of the stimulus gained by assisting with graduate work and in the loss to undergraduate students of the inspiration derived from the teaching of great men.

## VII

The real solution to the problem is one which goes to its origin. The villain is English A which all college students have to take and which allows far too many to become teachers in the first place. The temporary appointment rids each institution of its overflow;



it keeps the bottom open, and enables one to find a job on leaving the graduate school. There are those who think that the abolition of the elementary course as it is now recognized would be a most beneficial reform.<sup>1</sup> Such abolition would end once and for all the attraction into college teaching of large numbers of persons for whom there can be no future. It would revolutionize the prevailing system and would greatly minimize the young-teacher dilemma. In a few brave institutions like Columbia University and the University of New Hampshire the course in English A has been eliminated, but for most institutions such a move is out of the question. One needs only to think of the dislocation of present arrangements, of the revolutionary change involved in this suggested reform, to realize that for the time being it has no chance whatever.

Anyone who wishes to lessen the evils of temporary academic appointments must offer something which will not seriously disturb things as they are. The budget must not be agitated; the regular course in Freshman English must be left alone; the work of professors of long standing must not be interfered with; and, above all, the system of temporary appointments, whose evils are in question, must not be eliminated.

There is only one place where improvement is possible, because there is only one place where the ideal has any chance against the practical, where a man or an idea may survive solely on the basis of merit. I refer to the graduate school. Graduate schools should discourage the entrance into teaching of persons who are not fitted for the academic profession.

I am not sure, however, that, in order to cut down the number of new teachers, the work in the graduate school needs to be made any harder than it now is. There is no point in discouraging young teachers by mere bulk and complication of requirements, or by the multiplication of the hours and the days required to be spent in laboring over fantastic examinations. The test of a good teacher is not found merely in the brute stamina or the physical perseverance required to survive such disciplines. Actually those who should not hope for a career in teaching can be weeded out by the

<sup>1</sup> See O. J. Campbell, "Failure of Freshman English," *English Journal*, College Edition, XXVIII (1939), pp. 177-185.

graduate school before such persons have gone very far in their work for the Ph.D. degree. Those who lack the necessary intelligence and energy should be told at the end of their first year of graduate work that they are out of place. This would be a kindness both to them and to the profession. It may be necessary to eliminate later those whose work may have become mediocre or who may give evidence of defects of personality or temperament.

### VIII

Temporary appointments as teachers of elementary courses should normally be made only from among those who have not yet completed their work for the Ph.D. degree. During the temporary appointment the work of young teachers should be carefully observed so that those who show no promise may be discouraged from returning to the graduate school. The Ph.D. degree should not be given to teachers who have not demonstrated ability to teach. If this policy were pursued, the number of Ph.D. degrees granted would decline greatly and the level of competence in the profession would rise sharply. Some time soon the American graduate school will have to recognize its double function, the preparation not only of the scholar but of the teacher as well.

Even if teacher candidates have been sifted, there is another opportunity for selection at the time they are seeking permanent appointments. Great discrimination, I might even say honesty, should be exercised by those who write letters of recommendation for prospective teachers so that those who possess only average ability will not be encouraged to enter a profession which has difficulty in absorbing even able teachers. The graduate school should accept its responsibility in the matter of the admission of members to the academic profession and should give its approval only to the best.

The last challenge for those who have ended their first period of teaching will be the writing of a good dissertation. The graduate school should make it a fixed policy to demand greater thoroughness and conclusiveness in dissertations than is found in the immature, mechanical performances which are now sometimes submitted. A man with greater maturity and some professional ex-

perience should be expected to write a better dissertation than the average graduate student now produces.

A highly selected class of teachers would thus emerge from the graduate school at about the age of thirty. These persons should be offered only positions which are potentially permanent. The present four academic ranks could be reduced by half with one rank set aside for the teachers of distinction and of longer experience and the other rank inclusive of most of the teachers in the average department. Teachers with Ph.D. degrees and some experience would be admitted to the larger group where they would have every expectation of professional continuity unless they became incompetent. If the present numerous gradations were kept, these teachers could be given instructorships with the promise of promotion as soon as possible; even now, all institutions have occasional openings in the upper ranks. If anyone objects that such a plan forces young teachers to remain in the lowest rank for a long period, I answer that this cannot be helped. Most young persons now entering the academic profession should accept as inevitable a period of eight or ten years as instructors. No one has yet thought of or suggested anything which can possibly shorten this period. The plan herein outlined would lend dignity to the instructorship. It would help also to establish this guiding principle for academic administration: that a teacher who has a Ph.D. degree should never be forced from his position except for one reason, demonstrable incompetence.

The problem discussed here is in a sense only mechanical, yet it causes chairmen of large departments to be very gloomy about the future. They are aware of the fact that something will have to be done to encourage able persons to enter the academic profession. If something to accomplish this end cannot be done, the outlook for higher education is not bright.

## HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SECURITY<sup>1</sup>

By J. HAROLD GOLDTHORPE

American Council on Education

Recent issues of the *Bulletin* (June and December, 1941, and February, 1942) have carried articles and reports on subjects concerned with retirement annuities and the possible extension of the Social Security Act to institutions of higher education.

The article by Dr. Goldthorpe on the subject, "Higher Education and Social Security," and his accompanying memorandum are timely, pertinent, and clarifying contributions to common understanding of a subject of vital concern to college and university teachers. It is hoped that they will be widely and carefully read.—THE EDITOR.

Old-age and survivors insurance, one of the three major benefit programs<sup>2</sup> of the Social Security Board, is financed by payroll taxes levied against the employer and employee and provides benefit payments without a *means* test. Since institutions of higher education have been primarily concerned about plans for old-age protection, this article is limited to the consideration of the old-age and survivors insurance program under Title II of the Social Security Act.

Under this title of the act retired insured workers 65 years and over are provided with monthly primary benefits which vary from \$10 to \$85 a month, depending upon such factors as the period of service, the level of income during the period of coverage, the number of dependent children, and other factors of the benefit formula. Under the 1939 amendment to the Social Security Act, benefits are paid to the wives and widows of insured workers and to their dependent children under 18 years old in the event that insured workers die before attaining the age of 65. Under certain

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from the January, 1942 issue of *The Educational Record*.

<sup>2</sup> These three benefit programs are: (1) public assistance, providing benefit payments to the needy, aged, blind, and dependent children; (2) unemployment compensation; and (3) federal old-age and survivors insurance.

conditions in the absence of other qualified survivors, reduced monthly benefits are paid to the aged dependent parents of workers and a lump-sum payment is made upon the death of the insured without survivors entitled to regular monthly payments.

Thus, in addition to the protection for old age, there is now a well-balanced program to provide for the survivors in the event of the death of the insured worker. The Social Security Board has estimated that this program of survivors' benefits is approximately one-fourth of the Board's benefit plan. The officers of the Board have indicated that this increased volume of insurance amounts to approximately 40 billion dollars.

Faculty members and the nonprofessional employees of colleges and universities were excluded from federal coverage in the original act of 1935 and in the 1939 amendment although in the latter year their inclusion was recommended by the Advisory Council on Social Security and the Social Security Board. The reasons for this exemption were probably as follows: (1) doubt as to the federal government's authority to levy a tax upon the incomes of state and local governmental employees; (2) reasonable doubt of federal authority to tax the states and their political subdivisions for their share of the payroll taxes; (3) the fear of the privately controlled institutions that their present income tax exemption might be jeopardized in the event that the federal government collected payroll taxes to meet their share of the cost of old-age insurance protection; (4) the "entering wedge" argument that the federal government might encroach upon the independence of privately controlled institutions; (5) the fairly general belief that institutional staff members were already satisfactorily protected by pension plans.

#### *Specific Provisions of Coverage*

In order to provide a more satisfactory comprehension of the system of the federal old-age and survivors insurance, it will be well to summarize its more important provisions. Payroll taxes are collected from the employer and employee at the rate of 1 per cent each upon the worker's earnings up to \$3000 per year. Under the present law this payroll tax rate will rise to 2 per cent upon the employer and the employee in 1943, to 2½ per cent upon each

in 1946, and to 3 per cent upon each in 1949 and will continue at that rate thereafter. To maintain insured status for benefit payments, the insured is required to earn at least \$50 in one-half or more of the quarters during the period since the beginning of the operation of the act in 1937 or after he attains the age of 21.

In order to pay proportionately higher benefits to insured retired workers in the lower income brackets, the primary benefit is set at 40 per cent of the first \$50 of the worker's average monthly wage plus 10 per cent of the earnings above that amount upward to a maximum of \$250 a month (\$3000 per year). The benefit payment is further increased by 1 per cent for each additional year in which the insured earned an income of \$200 or more in covered employment. The operation of this plan can be best summarized by some specific examples. The individual with an average salary of \$100 per month after eight years of coverage is entitled to a monthly benefit payment of \$27. The person earning an average income of \$250 a month after forty years of coverage would receive upon retirement at the age 65 years or over a benefit of \$56 per month. This benefit payment is increased by 50 per cent if the insured's wife is likewise over 65 years, and by an additional 50 per cent if they have a dependent child under 18 years.

In the event of the protected worker's death before the age of 65 leaving a widow and children, monthly benefit payments are made until the children reach 18. Without dependent children the widow is eligible for monthly benefits upon attaining the age of 65 years. If neither a widow nor children survive but if the insured has been the source of support for a parent or both parents, such parents are eligible for benefits upon attaining the age 65. The widow's benefit is calculated at three-fourths of the insured's primary benefit, and the benefit for children or parents is equal to one-half the primary benefit.

For example, if an insured worker earning \$100 per month dies after ten years of coverage, his widow and a single child would receive a monthly benefit of \$34.38, or a benefit of \$48.13 if there are two dependent children. A protected worker who dies after forty years of coverage with average earnings of \$250 a month would leave his widow a monthly benefit payment of \$42 if she had de-



pendent children or was herself past 65. The maximum monthly benefit payable is twice the primary benefit of the insured worker or \$85, whichever is the lower except that it may not be less than \$20. For the individual who dies without dependents, a single lump-sum payment not to exceed six times the primary benefit is made to the survivors or in the event that he left no survivors eligible for monthly benefits, the payment is made to other persons who paid his burial expenses.

### *Extent of Present Old-Age Retirement Protection*

According to the *Biennial Survey of Education* recently published by the United States Office of Education and containing data for the academic year 1937-38 based upon 1690 of the nation's 1700 institutions of higher education, there were in these institutions approximately 140,000 staff members with faculty status, about one-half of whom were in the publicly controlled institutions. There is no comparable source of data concerning the number of nonprofessional and service employees. These staff members consist mainly of the janitorial, library, maintenance, museum, clerical, and secretarial staffs, together with the nurses and technicians in university hospitals. From such limited data as are available, the administrative officers of the Social Security Board estimate that this group of nonteaching personnel constitutes about one-third of the total institutional staff. For the present purpose it is reasonable to estimate the total staffs of institutions of higher education at approximately 200,000 employees.

An estimate of the old-age retirement coverage for the total group of staff members of these institutions is even more difficult. For this purpose it is necessary to rely upon three separate studies.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of these studies it appears that approximately 1120 higher institutions lack retirement plans providing old-age, death, and disability benefits for their staff members. Furthermore, this group of institutions without plans employs about two-fifths of the professional staffs in all higher institutions.

<sup>1</sup> Sherman E. Flanagan, *Insurance and Annuity Plans for College Staffs*, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1937, No. 5; Merrill G. Murray and Ilse M. Smith, "Higher Educational Institutions and the Social Security Act," *Social Security Bulletin*, III (December, 1940), 21-28; Rainard B. Robbins, *College Plans for Retirement Income* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940).

On the other hand, in the 580 institutions which do have formal plans, it is estimated that at least one-fourth of the professional and nonprofessional staffs are outside the scope of these plans.

Robbins indicated that the number of institutions which make specific provisions for the old-age protection of their nonprofessional employees did not exceed 30. From the fragmentary data now available it would probably be an optimistic estimate which would place more than 5 to 10 per cent of the nonprofessional employees of all higher institutions under some form of old-age retirement protection.

### *Reasons for the Reconsideration of Exemption*

It may be worth while to review briefly the more important reasons for the reconsideration of the exemption granted educational institutions by the original Social Security Act. Now that six years have elapsed since the passage of the law, it is desirable to reconsider this earlier decision. The Social Security Board, the President, and the Advisory Council on Social Security which framed the recommendations adopted in the 1939 amendment have supported the elimination of this exemption. Evidence of the increasing interest in this problem is indicated by the fact that there were introduced in the last Congress no less than eight specific bills to modify the exempted status. There are before this Congress at least four major bills concerned with the elimination of the current exemption. In this connection it is to be remembered that at present approximately one-half of all the nation's gainfully employed workers are under the social security program at any given time.

Some of the factors which argue for the necessity of re-examining the current exempted status of institutions of higher education are as follows: (1) the increased comprehension of and interest in the need for retirement protection; (2) extension of the federal plan to include benefit payments for widows and dependent children; (3) the recent extension on institutional initiative of retirement provisions to protect professional and nonprofessional staffs; (4) the desirability of maintaining continued protection for staff members who move from occupations covered by the act to

those occupations not now covered; (5) the limited and inadequate protection of many present institutional and state plans; and (6) the federal government's interest in the widest possible extension of the Social Security Act for the nation's social welfare.

There is still another factor in the present situation which must be given serious consideration by administrators of all institutions of higher education. As already indicated the Social Security Board has had under consideration for some time the problem of increased coverage and the President in his recent budget message to Congress recommended the extension of coverage to the now excluded occupations together with the reorganization of the whole social insurance program. The major feature of the contemplated reorganization as it affects institutions of higher education will probably center about the elimination of the exemption under the original act so as to include all higher institutions under the old-age and survivors insurance title of the law.

### *Legal Problems*

Federal coverage of the staffs of higher institutions cannot be adequately considered without examining the possible legal obstacles. With respect to extension to institutions under private control, there would appear to be no serious legal question. Practically, however, some educational leaders have expressed concern in the event of the elimination of the exemption from social security payroll taxes that their exemption under the federal income tax statute might also be impaired. Thus it is pointed out that the use of taxes for old-age insurance might open the way for the future imposition of general revenue taxes. Such a precedent scarcely appears probable since Congress by the 1939 amendment adopted the recommendation of the Advisory Council and the Secretary of the Treasury to convert the old-age reserve account into a trust fund without previously covering the payroll tax receipts into the Treasury. Higher institutions are subject to the federal admissions tax upon athletic receipts, in several states they are required to protect their employees under workmen's compensation laws, and in some states they are subject to special assessments not a part of the local property taxes.

In dealing with the problem of coverage for staffs of publicly controlled institutions, however, an entirely different legal question is involved. This is concerned with the authority of the federal government to collect from the state or city as an employer its share of the payroll taxes. The recent statute and subsequent judicial decisions have upheld the federal government's power to levy income taxes upon the salaries of employees of the states and their political subdivisions. Despite the fact that the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity is undergoing limitation, it is still undetermined that governmental units as employers can be subjected to payroll taxes. Upon this point the General Counsel of the Federal Security Agency has recently stated:

None of the recent cases has involved a tax upon the state itself, and the court has had no occasion to explore fully the implications of such taxation. The grounds on which it has greatly restricted the earlier doctrine of the immunity of state instrumentalities appear to be inapplicable to taxation of the states themselves. What considerations will be deemed controlling when this question is again presented to the court it would be difficult to foretell. But the probabilities are that the immunity of the states in their essential functions from federal taxation, however slight the practical burden might be, will be perpetuated.

This issue can finally be resolved only through the passage of an amendment extending social security and the payroll tax to the states and their subdivisions and through a subsequent decision by the United States Supreme Court. In the event that this procedure were followed, there would be considerable confusion, uncertainty, and possible wasted effort in the administration of the federal old-age insurance plan and in the coordination and administration of existing state and municipal plans for these institutions.

An alternative to compulsory coverage has been proposed by certain interested groups and involves the use of voluntary compacts. Thus the states, or their subordinate units, might decide what groups of their employees would be covered by the federal plan and could, if they decided to do so, exempt certain groups of employees or those who are members of existing retirement plans.

In general the Board's administrative officers are not inclined to look upon this plan with favor. They contend that it would be difficult and expensive to administer. Moreover, to assure members of the existing systems that such plans are adequate for their protection would require the Board to establish effective criteria of sound plans. The primary virtue of such a procedure would be to eliminate the opposition of the beneficiaries of the present state, municipal, and institutional retirement plans who now are opposed to compulsory coverage.

### *Coordination of Existing Retirement Systems*

In the event of inclusion under the federal old-age and survivors insurance plan, many institutions with existing retirement systems will, of course, be concerned about the future operation of their own plans. The existence of these systems has constituted an important reason, together with the legal barriers, for the original exemption of educational institutions. According to Robbins, about one-third of the 580 institutions having regular retirement systems have contracts with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association calling for contributions by the institutions and their staff members. The staff members of the other institutions are protected by various commercial contracts, denominational pension plans, general state and municipal retirement systems, special institutional plans, and in a number of institutions by budgeted payments out of current institutional income.

Present retirement plans could be readily adjusted and reorganized in order to make them supplementary to the federal system. If the experience of the last six years in private industry is an indication, this would be the normal procedure. Studies by the Social Security Board indicate that very few industries and business firms have dismantled their own plans since the passage of the original act in 1935. In most instances they have reorganized their plans, added disability and supplementary benefits, and liberalized other features of their retirement systems. This action has been particularly true for that group of employees whose annual income exceeds \$3000 since the federal payroll tax of 2 per cent (1 per cent from the employer and 1 per cent from the

employee) is collected only upon the amount of the income below that level. It should be taken into consideration at all times that the federal old-age and survivors insurance program aims only to provide a "floor of protection." Since the maximum benefit payment under this plan is \$85 a month, many institutions will probably utilize their present plans to pay benefits in excess of that amount, particularly to their professional staffs.

### *Present Congressional Prospects*

At this time two major bills are before the House and two before the Senate which would affect the faculties and staffs of the institutions of higher education. The Lesinski Bill (H.R. 1092) before the House of Representatives would extend coverage under the old-age insurance title to employees of the states and their political subdivisions and would require the state or employing governmental unit to pay old-age payroll taxes as well as to require such taxes from their employees. The purpose of this bill is primarily to test the constitutional question relative to the authority of the federal government to collect such taxes from a sovereign state.

Another measure introduced into the House is the Healey Bill (H.R. 4882) which would provide compulsory old-age insurance coverage for most currently exempted groups except public employees who could be included by means of voluntary compacts between the states or their subordinate units and the Social Security Board. There is the further provision in this bill that no state or local employee now covered by an existing retirement plan could come under the federal system.

Two major proposals have also been introduced in the Senate. The Walsh Bill (S. 670) is the same measure that was introduced in the last session and would extend old-age insurance coverage to all employees, except ministers, of the private nonprofit group of charitable, educational, and religious institutions. Obviously, the provisions of this bill would extend coverage only to the privately controlled higher institutions. The Johnson Bill (S. 1952) would provide coverage under the old-age insurance title of the act to "teachers and other employees in the public schools of the states or



political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof." It is clear that the provisions of this proposal would include faculty members and other employees of state universities, land-grant colleges, public teachers colleges, municipal institutions, and public junior colleges.

Although there are other proposals seeking to amend the old-age and public assistance titles of the Social Security Act, this group of four proposals is of greatest interest to the institutions of higher education. The bills have been referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate. It appears likely that plans will be undertaken soon to enact into law the President's recommendations for the comprehensive reorganization and extension of the whole social security program.

### *Conclusion*

These are some of the administrative and legal problems and the legislative prospects to date upon the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to the faculty and nonprofessional staffs of higher institutions. Despite the considerable increase in the number of plans for old-age retirement protection at institutional and state initiative, there is still a considerable proportion of these staff members without systematic protection of the character provided by the federal social security program. Extended protection under the federal program could make provision for institutional employees and their families and could supplement the provisions of existing retirement plans. It appears reasonably clear that whatever specific recommendations are made by the Social Security Board, the necessary bills to implement them will be accorded adequate discussion in and out of the congressional hearings and that final legislation will eventuate for the general good of institutions of higher education.

## A Memorandum Concerning Recent Proposed Social Security Amendments

The proposal to extend coverage under the federal Social Security plan so as to include groups now exempted was emphasized in the following section of President Roosevelt's budget message of January 7, 1942:

I oppose the use of pay-roll taxes as a measure of war finance unless the worker is given his full money's worth in increased social security. From the inception of the social security program in 1935 it has been planned to increase the number of persons covered and to provide protection against hazards not initially included. By expanding the program now, we advance the organic development of our social security system and at the same time contribute to the anti-inflationary program.

I recommend an increase in the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance, addition of permanent and temporary disability payments and hospitalization payments beyond the present benefit programs, and liberalization and expansion of unemployment compensation in a uniform national system. I suggest that collection of additional contributions be started as soon as possible, to be followed one year later by the operation of the new benefit plans.

Additional employer and employee contributions will cover increased disbursements over a long period of time. Increased contributions would result in reserves of several billion dollars for post-war contingencies. The present accumulation of these contributions would absorb excess purchasing power. Investment of the additional reserves in bonds of the United States Government would assist in financing the war.

The existing administrative machinery for collecting pay-roll taxes can function immediately. For this reason Congressional consideration might be given to immediate enactment of this proposal, while other necessary measures are being perfected.

I estimate that the social security trust funds would be increased through the proposed legislation by 2 billion dollars during the fiscal year 1943.

### *Plans for the Reorganization of the Social Security Structure*

Even before President Roosevelt made his recommendations to Congress, the officers of the Social Security Board had under con-

sideration for some time plans for the extension and reorganization of the social security program. More recently, because of the Defense Program and Selective Service, the Board's officers have been working upon the adjustment of their program to meet the needs of thousands of young men who will return from military service, and the large numbers of workers who are leaving private employment to accept positions with the Federal Government in the defense agencies and in government plants and shipyards.

In the effort to meet the new demands created by the defense program and now by war itself, the administrative officers of the Social Security Board have under consideration the following proposals:

- (1) Improvement of the financial basis of the state unemployment compensation systems; extension of coverage to employees of smaller firms; and increasing the adequacy of benefit payments.
- (2) Extension of coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program to groups not now included; principally domestic servants, agricultural workers, the self-employed, the public employees and employees of nonprofit, religious, educational, and charitable organizations.
- (3) Introduction of permanent and temporary disability benefits.
- (4) Reorganization of federal grants for the public assistance programs for the aged, dependent children, and the blind, so as to provide larger federal payments to the states of low fiscal capacity; federal matching of the expenditures by the states (up to a specified amount) for medical services and supplies to recipients of public assistance.
- (5) Federal grants to the states similar to those now provided for special types of assistance for needy individuals who do not fall within the special groups now under public assistance, the insurance programs or the federal works programs.
- (6) Legislative action to protect the benefit rights of persons who leave their customary employment for public service either in the civilian or the armed services.

At present, the cost of the federal old-age and survivors insurance plan is financed by a payroll tax of one per cent each upon the employer and employee. On the other hand, the state unemployment compensation systems are financed by a 3 per cent

payroll tax upon the employer alone, except in five states where an employee also contributes from one to one and one-half per cent of his wages. It will be seen that these two plans are supported by a total payroll tax of 5 per cent; 4 per cent of which is carried by the employer and one per cent by the employee. Plans are now under consideration which would add benefits for disability and hospitalization and would provide for payment of all benefits from a reserve fund administered by the federal government. In return for liberalized benefits it is hoped to advance the payroll taxes for the support of the program. No definite recommendations have yet been made, but the total cost may be increased to 8 or 10 per cent, probably with equal sharing between the employer and the employee. There is also some discussion of the possibility of the federal government sharing in the cost of these programs through appropriations from its general tax revenues.

Arguments in favor of a single national system with a pooled reserve fund are that it would: (1) greatly simplify administration; (2) reduce the number of reports from employers; (3) render more effective the work of the employment service; (4) give equal treatment to all employers and employees in the states under a single national benefit formula; (5) eliminate the danger of insolvency of existing state unemployment compensation funds, a danger that is real in states whose dominant industries suffer from wide seasonal or cyclical fluctuations.

### *Congressional Prospects*

At the present time there are approximately one hundred bills before the various congressional committees which seek to amend in some form or another the present Social Security program. Up to this time hearings have not yet started upon these proposals so that the specific recommendations of the Social Security Board are not yet available.

A related proposal which bears upon this general situation is the reported plan of the Treasury Department based upon Secretary Morgenthau's recent recommendation of the adoption of withholding income tax collected at source. At various times a rate between five and fifteen per cent has been mentioned in connection with this proposal. The adoption of such a proposal could be

readily integrated with the payroll taxes for Social Security purposes. In fact there is much to be said for this proposal in the interest of simplification of administration and in the reduction in compliance costs. The final details of such a plan will be available only when the Treasury has presented its recommendations to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

#### *Activities of the American Council on Education*

The American Council on Education has sponsored two meetings, one last February and the other in May, of representatives of the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and other educational associations together with the administrative officers of the Social Security Board. Acting upon the recommendations of the May conference, the Council cooperated in a canvass of the administrators of higher institutions concerning their attitudes towards the several problems of social security coverage. Inquiry blanks were forwarded to the members of these several associations and returns were obtained from 555 institutions.

Since the Association of American Colleges had considered these problems at several recent annual meetings and had previously polled its membership, the officers thought it unnecessary at that time to canvass the membership again. At its January meeting in Baltimore, it reaffirmed its endorsement of coverage under the *old-age and survivors insurance*, but has consistently expressed opposition to inclusion under the *unemployment compensation* section of the Act.

Briefly, the results of The American Council's canvass indicated that more than four-fifths of the administrative heads of these institutions favored coverage of their entire staffs under the *old-age and survivors insurance* plan. There was overwhelming agreement as indicated by ninety-one per cent of the responses favoring coverage under the federal plan for their nonprofessional staffs including maintenance, secretarial, and clerical employees. It was surprising to learn that one-half of this group of administra-

tors also favored coverage of their staffs under the *unemployment compensation* provisions of the Act. Approximately one-half of these administrators would not exempt staff members in existing retirement plans from coverage under the federal system. This would suggest either an adequate comprehension of the difficulties in administering such exemptions and of developing satisfactory criteria for these plans, or it may also indicate the realistic recognition of the inadequacies and limited benefits of many present institutional, state and insurance company plans.

J. HAROLD GOLDTHORPE

June 1, 1942



## WHAT UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AND ADMINISTRATORS OWE TO EACH OTHER<sup>1</sup>

By ROBERT E. BUCHANAN

Iowa State College

The question posed by your president is: In a machine as complicated as Iowa State College how does one keep professors and administrators functioning together without too much friction? It is a question which merits careful consideration. There is, however, one implication in the title which troubles me. I am asked to speak as an administrator to professors, as a representative of one class or stratum in our academic hierarchy to those of another. I would much prefer to speak as one university professor to his colleagues on problems of university administration which concern us all. I am even more convinced that I would prefer speaking as a professor to professors since reading this squib ascribed to Dean Lyon of Minnesota:

Persons of good morals, willingness, and courtesy, but who can neither teach nor investigate, are appointed as deans, registrars, business managers, and janitors.

The definition has certain connotations that bother me. I can't dodge the accusation of being an administrator. At different times and for varying periods I have served as dean of Science, as dean of the Graduate College; as director of the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station. I even served for two years as director of the Summer Session, and during the last war as supervisor for the College of the Student Army Training Corps. Looking at myself as objectively as possible, I can see why some persons who don't know me any too well might classify me as an administrator. But I am sure that careful scrutiny would con-

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered on October 28, 1941 in Ames, Iowa, at a faculty luncheon sponsored by the Iowa State College chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Reprinted from *The Alumnus of Iowa State College*, November, 1941, Vol. XXXVII, No. 3.

vince you that at heart I am still a carefree professor with all the professorial naïveté. This is, you can readily see, a plea that you regard me as residing with you on Gulliver's floating island of the unpronounceable name rather than on the main land. I don't like to have the professors look down their noses at me as a mere administrator. I assert that I am a professor.

But seriously, what do professors and administrators owe to each other? What I have to say will be inconclusive, incomplete and, I suspect (shall I say in consequence?), innocuous as well. One cannot even outline in twenty minutes the chapter headings of the book that should be written on the subject. Some day someone (not myself) who is really interested in administration as such will write such a book.

## II

Before we discuss the interrelations of professor and administrator, on the assumption that both have useful functions to perform, we may well look first at the institution which both are supposed to serve. A university, the Iowa State College to be specific, has as its objective the advancement of culture and learning among the people. In accomplishing this purpose, it must correlate three types of activities: First, it must constitute a great reservoir of knowledge, it must constantly discover new springs of knowledge on the unexplored mountain slopes and channel them into this great reservoir so that it grows ever larger and deeper, and it must use this great reservoir more and more for the development of power and for the replenishment and enlargement of the irrigation streams which may serve to enrich the lives of all the people. The university reservoir is its staff, its library, and, to a lesser degree, its special physical facilities. Research, including all productive scholarship, is the search for the new streams which may be diverted to the reservoir. The teaching function both intramural and extramural is charged both with converting the tremendous latent energy of this reservoir into kinetic energy into power and with conducting its life-giving floods through the irrigating streams of knowledge so that all the people may reap the benefits.

In other words, this institution, like all universities, has three primary functions, to discover, to conserve, and to impart knowledge.

A university in a modern world, in order to satisfy its potentialities, must be related to its environment in a very matter of fact fashion. It must relate itself to a variety of external agencies and organizations. To be specific, the Iowa State College must relate itself to the state and federal governments which have created and endowed it—likewise to groups, agencies and organizations which are active in planning for the future, also to many pressure groups, inasmuch as they have been responsible for past legislation creating and supporting the Iowa State College and in the future will be responsible for enactment of legislation relating to the institution.

We live in a world which definitely is committed to the utilization of techniques other than those of education in raising the standards of living and thinking of people. Our government on federal, state, and local levels has created a number of administrative agencies utilizing grants-in-aid, the taxing power or even the police power to get results. These are frequently termed action agencies. Sometimes we, as educators, are tempted to take over the techniques appropriate to the action agencies. To yield to this temptation means that the institution would assume highly inappropriate functions; any tendency in this direction should be firmly resisted. Equally undesirable are tendencies on the part of action agencies to take over our educational functions. Evidently the wisest coordination is needed. We here at Iowa State must work with the Association of Iowa Manufacturers, the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and dozens of other agencies and organizations. But we should not work under them. All this working together, the required coordination, connotes administration.

### III

Evidently then the relationships of the Iowa State College and of its constituent parts to the outside world are exceedingly complicated. So, too, are the internal relationships. We have nu-

merous subdivisions set up for the accomplishment of specific results. The parts must fit together, each must mesh with the others. Let's look at Iowa State College on the inside for a moment. We have said that one of its functions is to maintain a staff engaged in research, in productive scholarship, and to provide the facilities for their work. There have been set up four research institutes: (1) the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station to provide for agriculture and home economics including all science basic or related thereto; (2) the Engineering Experiment Station which provides for research in a great area comprising all of engineering and its supporting sciences; (3) the Veterinary Research Institute with its studies in fundamental animal sciences as these relate to the health of domestic animals, and frequently to human health as well; (4) the Industrial Science Research Institute which emphasizes the carrying forward of many of the basic sciences into their specialized applications. Each of these has its facilities and its staff, and all involve problems of relationship within and without. Administration is the functioning of any and all techniques and devices that enable these institutes to integrate satisfactorily with each other, with the other parts of Iowa State College, and with the environing agencies and organizations.

Another function of Iowa State is to conserve knowledge and make it conveniently available. This requires the building of a competent staff and the maintenance and development of libraries and museums. Again there are the problems of integration and interrelationships inside and outside the campus walls, and these too involve administration.

Then there is the teaching function. We have divided the total area of service at Iowa State College into five sub-areas which we call colleges or divisions—Agriculture, Engineering, Home Economics, Science, and Veterinary Medicine. These all entail integration within and without, the development of administration. Next we proceed to divide the institution in quite another way, into the Junior College, the Senior College, and the Graduate College, all with staffs and interrelationships demanding administration. And then we partition the teaching functions on still another plane into intramural teaching and extramural teaching

or extension and the latter again into agricultural and home economics extension and engineering extension. And these all involve still more interrelationships.

Furthermore, any institution such as Iowa State College must hold itself accountable for what it does; it must record and classify its actions. There must be established accounting systems on a grand scale. First there are the problems of financial accounting handled by the offices of the business manager and of the treasurer. Then there must be an elaborate system of academic accounting handled by a registrar, and just as truly it is necessary that there be research accounting through projects and specific grants-in-aid. And in all of these again there is need of integration and administration.

Nor does this list include all of our complicated organization. For example, there are important agencies for providing physical facilities for work, such as our Department of Buildings and Grounds. But we have gone quite far enough to indicate clearly the extraordinary complexity of our organization, and the apparent necessity for administrative machinery.

What is good administration? It is keeping the intricate machine functioning with a reasonable degree of efficiency and economy, and with an adequate sense of responsibility to the general public, to the students and to the staff members.

Thus far you may well say I have done everything except talk on the topic assigned me, what university professors and administrators owe to each other. I do have a few words to say on this specific topic, but I was desirous first of disabusing your minds, if possible, of the not uncommon heresy that administration is unimportant or functionless.

#### IV

As phrased, the topic itself postulates a distinction which in my opinion is very often overemphasized. We do have administrative officials that do no teaching or research, but we have almost no teachers or researchers who do not participate in administration to some degree. Every member of the teaching and research staffs shares more or less in administrative responsibility. To line up

professors and administrators in two distinct categories may not therefore be the best approach.

A paramount duty of administrators is to endeavor to relieve members of the teaching and research staffs (the professors, if you please) of all details of administration so far as possible wherever such administrative duties can as well be performed by the "professional administrative" staff. The administrator owes it to the professor to free his time to his area of specialization. A professor should not be required even to sign his name in an administrative capacity if this can be avoided. The administrator has no right to relieve his own office by requiring assumption of unnecessary administrative duties by others. The administrator should assume the burden of unwinding in so far as this is possible the red-tape which he may create. Conversely the professor should be entirely willing to assume such assignments of administrative detail as cannot in the nature of the case be handled by the "pure" administrator. Cordial cooperation is due. Sometimes this is not accorded.

Another factor must be considered carefully in any discussion of what we "owe" each to the other? To whom are we ultimately responsible? Is the professor responsible to the administrator? There are plenty of instances of administrators in academic circles who have insisted that the relation must be that of soldier and captain, who believe in faculty discipline of the same type and achieved by the same techniques as army discipline. Or is the administrator responsible to the professors? Frankly, I have heard discussions in which incidentally some members of the Iowa State chapter of the American Association of University Professors participated, which led one to infer that this is the relationship which should obtain. What a glorious world if administrators would carry out the behests of a faculty made up solely of professors. Possibly we should revert to the old practice of the University of Paris where the professors were definitely and directly responsible to the students, who hired them and fired them.

How is it or how should it be at Iowa State? None of these points of view is particularly helpful. We as administrators and professors are all primarily responsible to the people of the State of Iowa. The question is not what we owe to each other, but what



we owe to the people of Iowa. Administrators and professors are both responsible to the people. The changes should be rung on that theme until we appreciate what it means; responsibility to Iowa as a symbol of all the people.

What is it that we owe to the people? We, both administrators and professors, are hired by the people of the state in a strictly professional capacity. When you hire a physician to diagnose and heal in your home you employ him as a professional man. You recognize that he has a whole armamentarium of techniques, knowledge and skills which you do not possess. In undertaking practice in your home, the physician as a professional man becomes responsible to you. If he betrays in any way that responsibility he is a quack and should be disciplined.

Just so, we as professors and administrators are hired as professional men and women. We have direct obligations to the people of the state quite comparable to the obligation of physician to patient. The point I am making is just this. What we owe to each other as administrators and professors is, after all, incidental to what we as professional men and women owe to our clients.

## V

Further, both administrators and professors should recognize the principle of complete accountability. The professor is assigned funds for expenditure for research or teaching. He must regard himself as completely accountable, and not balk at reasonable financial accounting procedures. He must be academically accountable for grades and reports relative to his students. He should be willing to participate in a reasonable research accounting by submitting fair and accurate reports of progress. He should carefully refrain from the too frequent assumption that salary and current expense funds are personal grants-in-aid with no accountability. Conversely, the administrator should assume as far as he can the burden of accountability for finances for research and the keeping of grades.

Another point: Each group owes it to the other to reduce friction between administrators and professors by endeavoring to

learn and appreciate the history and objectives of their institution. It is not good for any university constantly to fill its vacancies with its own graduates. It should not be too highly inbred. It is very desirable that vacancies and new positions should be filled in part with individuals who have had experience in other institutions. But the professor who holds on the basis of his experience elsewhere that whatever is, is wrong, at Iowa State College, without any knowledge of its history or background, is a real trial to an administrator (and, parenthetically, to his own colleagues as well). Conversely, the administrator who turns thumbs down on a faculty addition because he has some new or variant ideas which he would like to express, is likewise doing a disservice to Iowa State College. We may well call such an individual a poor administrator. Then, too, we may have an administrator who comes in full of new ideas. The staff can make life rather uncomfortable for him if its members are convinced he does not have the institutional background to know how our machine is geared together. One can only hope for a good deal of tolerance and the constant endeavor to respect the other fellow's point of view.

## VI

Most important of all, professors and administrators should plan together. We may agree that there are some types of administrative decisions that must be made by the administrator without participation of the professor, just as there are professorial decisions to be made independently of the administrator. But, in general, the planning, the outlining of the future, the policy-making, should constitute a distinctly cooperative enterprise. Planning frequently requires also the active participation of non-academic interests. In the very nature of things the contacts with the non-academic participants in planning are likely to be through the administrators. This area of planning is exactly the one in which there arises the greatest amount of friction and misunderstanding. Frankly it is not difficult after a director or dean is firmly seated, for him to become a little czar and conclude he should do all the planning. I am inclined to believe that if he is worth anything as an administrator he must shoulder the major burden of the plan-

ning, but he makes a real mistake unless he not only invites but insists upon cooperation of the staff in planning. Conversely, there should be an interest in planning and a willingness to participate on the part of the professorial staff. Even more, there should be some degree of insistence on the part of the staff members that they do participate in the planning and policy determination. The administrator who rebuffs reasonable and well-meant efforts at participation in planning sets himself up as a "little czar" indeed. It should be noted, however, that the professor who will have nothing to do with planning for the institution as a whole or will plan only to advance the interests of himself or his department is rather more common than the administrator who insists upon exclusive jurisdiction in the realm of policy-making.

A last word: An institution such as Iowa State College should be democratic in its ideals as to relationships between professor and administrator. This means opportunity for contacts on and between all levels. As an administrator one of my most serious problems is the resentment aroused in some department heads if I discuss problems with any members of their staffs for they are disposed to insist that everything must be routinized, army style, and go through regular channels.

May I put a question to you seriously? How would you vote on this question, Resolved that there is a much larger proportion of petty tyranny in the professorial than in the administrative staff? You recognize that the posing of a question such as this in closing is what is technically known as dragging a red herring across the trail. My objective in asking this question is, of course, to focus your attention on a question put which may serve to divert your attention from the equally embarrassing question you may be ready to ask me. I hope I have put you off the scent.

## ASSOCIATION NEWS

### Nominating Committee for 1942

At the spring meeting of the Council of the Association on April 25 and 26, 1942, the following were appointed to the 1942 Nominating Committee: Professors Victor D. Hill, Classics, Ohio University, Chairman; Walter G. Cady, Physics, Wesleyan University and William M. Hepburn, Law, University of Alabama. A tabulation of the suggestions for Council membership, submitted by members of the Association pursuant to By-Law No. 1, was sent to each member of the Committee several weeks in advance of the meeting of the Committee, which was held in Washington, D. C., on June 4. The report of the Committee will be published in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

### Regional Meetings

#### *Hays, Kansas*

The chapters and members of the Association in Kansas held their annual meeting at Fort Hays State College in Hays, Kansas on March 28, 1942. About 30 members from the various colleges in the state attended. Professor A. B. Sageser of Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science was in charge of the program.

At the morning session Professor C. M. Correll of Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science read a paper on "The Newly Organized Faculty Council at the Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science." Dr. E. O. Stene of the University of Kansas discussed the subject, "Some Problems in the Application of Social Security Legislation to the State Schools." The session was concluded with a discussion by Professor Frank E. E. Germann of the University of Colorado, member of Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, on "The Work and Organization of the Faculty Governing Body at the University of Colorado."

Professor Myrta McGinnis of the host chapter presided at the afternoon session. During this session Dr. Harry Hall of Kansas State Teachers College at Pittsburg presented suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of the Association which had been made by various members of the chapter.

### *Syracuse, New York*

The Syracuse University chapter of the American Association of University Professors was host at a regional dinner meeting of the Association for the chapters and members in central New York on Monday, May 4, 1942. One hundred and thirty-five persons were in attendance from four institutions: Hobart College, Russell Sage College, Colgate University, and Syracuse University. Among those present were six members of the Board of Trustees of Syracuse University and their wives and several administrative officers of the University.

The program of the meeting was built around the principal address of the evening delivered by Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association. Dr. Himstead's subject was "Higher Education and the War." The functions of the Association both in normal and in war times were clearly set forth. Some individual problems handled by the Association were presented, and specific professional difficulties arising out of emergency conditions were analyzed and discussed. The address which was informative and challenging was enthusiastically received.

### **Chapter Activities**

*Pennsylvania State College.* The chapter commemorated the twentieth year of its establishment with a dinner meeting on the evening of March 27. There were 84 persons present, including Dr. R. D. Hetzel, President of the College, and five members of the Board of Trustees.

Professor J. H. Frizzell was the toastmaster. In accordance with a plan fostered in 1935, the chapter honored two emeritus teachers who had retired within the preceding twelve months.

The principal speaker of the occasion was Dr. Ralph E. Him-

stead, General Secretary of the Association. He spoke on the subject, "Principles and Policies of the Association."

An attractive booklet, entitled "Twenty Years of the American Association of University Professors at The Pennsylvania State College," was presented to each person. The booklet (of 12 pages) presented materials under the following headings: The First Ten Years, The Last Ten Years, National Contacts, Current Problems and Future Objectives, Insurance and Retirement at The Pennsylvania State College, The National Organization, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. A list of the present members of the chapter was included together with a list of chapter officers and committee personnel.

There was also included in the booklet the following letter from the President of the Association, Professor W. T. Laprade of Duke University:

I am glad to send congratulations and good wishes to The Pennsylvania State College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors on the occasion of the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of its establishment. I regret my inability to be present in person to share in commemorating the achievement of one of the larger chapters in the Association and to urge the importance at present of maintaining interest in the Association and of increasing its membership in order that the teaching profession may have an adequate agency for exercising its due influence in guiding the course of higher education in the trying years ahead.

One hundred copies of the booklet have been ordered by the national office for distribution to chapters of comparable size.

The Committee on Arrangements for the twentieth anniversary celebration was composed of the following members: Professors A. W. Case, Fine Arts, Chairman; L. T. Dunlap, Mathematics; Elisabeth W. Dye, Home Economics; B. R. Gardner, Journalism; and G. F. Mitch, Economics.

*Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse).* The local chapter of the Association and the members of Phi Beta Kappa resident in La Crosse held a second joint dinner on April 27. These dinners are held annually in connection with the newly



established college honors assembly as a means of bringing scholars of established reputation to La Crosse. Dr. Joseph W. Beach, Chairman of the English Department of the University of Minnesota and a member of both organizations in Minneapolis, delivered a paper entitled "A Dialectic of the Romanticists." Informal discussion followed.

On the next day Professor Beach addressed the honors assembly of the college, discussing the problem of the individual in a social group, especially as developed by the Victorian prose writers.

Dr. E. C. Knowlton, Chairman, Dr. Alvida Ahlstrom, Miss Gabriella Brendemuhl, Miss Dorothy M. Cott, and Mrs. Otto M. Schlabach, constituted the committee on arrangements.

## Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana ( <i>Bulletin</i> , April, 1938, pp. 321-348; December, 1939, pp. 578-584; February, 1940, pp. 73-91; December, 1940, pp. 602-606)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College, West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940
Western Washington College of Education (Board of Trustees), Bellingham, Washington (February, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 48-60)	December, 1941

## COUNCIL RECORD

Sessions, December 27 and 29, 1941

The 1941 winter meeting of the Council of the American Association of University Professors was held in Chicago, Illinois at the Stevens Hotel with sessions on Saturday, December 27 (9:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M.) and on Monday, December 29 (9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.). The following members were present at one or more of the sessions: President Deibler, Vice-Presidents Stewart and White, General Secretary Himstead, Associate Secretary Green, Treasurer Lewis, and Professors Brownell, Bushey, D'Evelyn, Dow, Gilbert, Griffin, Hill, Hosford, Hughes, Ingraham, Jamison, Kinneman, Langley, Martin, Nichols, Patton, Stonequist, Torrey, Vance, Vieg, Ward, and Weiss. Professor W. T. Laprade, Chairman of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Professor W. W. Cook, Chairman of Committee O on Organization and Policy, and Professor W. M. Hepburn, Chairman of Committee on Resolutions for the Annual Meeting, were present by invitation. Professors A. C. Cole and S. Stephenson Smith, former members of the Council, were visitors at some of the sessions. Professors A. Curtis Wilgus and Walther I. Brandt, members-elect of the Council, were in attendance at the sessions on December 29.

### I. Consideration of Subjects in Preparation for Annual Meeting

*Report of Committee O on Organization and Policy.* Professor W. W. Cook, Chairman of Committee O on Organization and Policy, reported briefly on the work of the committee during 1941. He explained the two Constitutional amendments which were to be presented to the Annual Meeting for action.

The first of these amendments related to some of the provisions in Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution which govern the election of officers and the elective members of the Council. The

amendment provides for the election of the President, the two Vice-Presidents, and the elective members of the Council by a proportional vote taken in the manner prescribed in Article X of the Constitution. Professor Cook stressed the fact that the purpose of this amendment was to strengthen the representative character of the Association by making possible the election of the officers of the Association and the members of the Council by a majority of all the members of the Association rather than by a majority of the members present at the Annual Meeting. By an informal vote the Council indicated its *endorsement* of this amendment.

The second amendment submitted by Committee O was in reference to Associate membership in the Association. The proposal was to add to Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution a second sentence to provide for the election of certain persons to Associate membership. With the added sentence, Section 4 of Article II of the Constitution would read as follows:

Associate Members. Any member who ceases to be eligible for Active or Junior membership, because his work has become primarily administrative, may be transferred with the approval of the Council to Associate membership. A person who has shown an interest in higher education and demonstrated his sympathy with the ideals of the Association may be elected by the Council to Associate membership.

In presenting this amendment Professor Cook stated that it was designed in part as a substitute for suggestions made by some members that all college and university administrative officers be declared eligible for election to Active or Associate membership. He pointed out, however, that the amendment did not apply to college and university officers *per se*, but to any person who, in the opinion of the Council, possesses the requisite qualifications for Associate membership indicated in the amendment. In an informal vote following a thoroughgoing and spirited discussion of this proposal, the Council indicated its *disapproval*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For Annual Meeting action on the two amendments submitted by Committee O on Organization and Policy, see report of Annual Meeting, February, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 8-9.

*Committee on Resolutions.* President Deibler announced the personnel of the Committee on Resolutions for the Annual Meeting as follows: Professors William M. Hepburn, Chairman, Victor D. Hill, Mark H. Ingraham, John Q. Stewart, and Laura A. White.

Professor Hepburn, Secretary Himstead, and several members of the Council suggested statements of principles and policies for consideration. Following a full discussion of these suggestions, the Council by an informal vote *endorsed* in principle for Annual Meeting action statements concerning War Adjustments, Totalitarian Suppression of Academic Freedom, and the Hatch Act.<sup>1</sup>

*Report and Recommendations of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.* Professor W. T. Laprade, Chairman of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, reviewed and commented on the salient facts found in the several investigations, reports of which were published in the *Bulletin* during 1941: Western Washington College of Education, The University of Kansas City, and Adelphi College. He reported that it was the recommendation of Committee A that the administrations of these three institutions be placed on the Association's censured list.

On separate motions followed by discussion it was *voted* to recommend to the Annual Meeting of the Association the censuring of the administrations of Western Washington College of Education, The University of Kansas City, and Adelphi College. In the case of Western Washington College of Education, censure was specifically directed at the institution's Board of Trustees.

Professor Laprade and the General Secretary reported on faculty dismissals at several institutions in the University System of Georgia, caused by political interference on the part of Governor Eugene Talmadge. Professor Laprade reported that it was the consensus of Committee A, pending completion of the Association's investigation of these dismissals, that the Annual Meeting should adopt a clarifying statement on the basis of facts then available.

It was *voted* that the Chairman of Committee A and the General Secretary should prepare a statement concerning political inter-

<sup>1</sup> For text of report of Committee on Resolutions presented to the Annual Meeting on December 28, 1941, see February, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 13-15.

ference in the University System of Georgia for Annual Meeting action.<sup>1</sup>

Secretary Himstead reported on academic freedom and tenure conditions at Montana State University and raised the question whether, in view of the fact that the University now has a new President and the fact that all but one of the teachers recently dismissed had been reinstated, the Association should remove the University's administration from the censured list. He reported that the members of the Association's Investigating Committee had indicated that they were opposed to such action until or unless Dr. Paul C. Phillips had been reinstated to the faculty. It was the consensus of the group that, however favorable recent developments at Montana State University might be, it would be unwise to lift the censure of the administration of the University at this time.

Professor Griffin brought to the attention of the Council a request from several members of the faculty of Central Washington College of Education that the administration of that institution be removed from the Association's censured list because of improved faculty-administration relations and recognition by its administration of satisfactory tenure rules. In the discussion of this request, Professor Laprade reported that full information concerning these seemingly favorable developments at Central Washington College of Education had as yet not been made available to the officers of the Association. It was the sense of the meeting that the data available concerning the situation at Central Washington College of Education were insufficient to warrant consideration of the favorable action requested.

*1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure.* President Deibler presented for further consideration the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure to ascertain whether there had been any change of opinion concerning the statement since the 1941 spring meeting of the Council, at which time the Council approved the statement and recommended its endorsement by the 1941 Annual Meeting. A brief discussion indicated that there had been no change of opinion with reference

<sup>1</sup> For statement of Annual Meeting action Concerning Political Interference in the University System of Georgia, see February, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 11-13.



to the statement and the desirability of its endorsement by the Annual Meeting.

## II. Academic Freedom and Tenure and Freedom of Speech

*Communication from the American Committee on Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.* A communication from the American Committee on Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, addressed to all the members of the Council, with reference to the tenure situation in the Colleges of the City of New York, urging intervention by the American Association of University Professors, was discussed.

The General Secretary reported that the Association had received many letters about the recent tenure difficulties in the New York City Colleges, but that none of the dismissed teachers had sought the advice or the help of the Association.<sup>1</sup>

It was the sense of the meeting that the alleged disregard of generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure in the New York City Colleges should be handled by the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure rather than by the Council and that the policy of Committee A not to intervene unless requested to do so by a teacher whose tenure is affected should be adhered to with reference to the recent tenure difficulties in the New York City Colleges.

*The Abstracting of Social Science Books by the National Association of Manufacturers.* In the absence of a report from Committee B on Freedom of Speech with reference to a study of the work of a special committee of the National Association of Manufacturers to abstract social science books authorized by previous Council action, Professor Kinneman moved the adoption of a resolution which he had presented to the Council of the Association at its 1941 spring meeting.<sup>2</sup>

In the discussion of Professor Kinneman's motion, it was pointed out that this activity of the National Association of Manufactur-

<sup>1</sup> For previous Council action with reference to academic freedom and tenure in the New York City Colleges, see December, 1941 *Bulletin*, pp. 622-625.

<sup>2</sup> For text of Professor Kinneman's motion and previous Council action with reference thereto, see record of 1941 spring Council meeting December, 1941 *Bulletin*, pp. 627-628.

ers in appointing a committee to abstract social science books was also being studied by the American Historical Association. Several members of the Council expressed doubt about the wisdom of referring this subject to Committee B or the adoption of the pending motion without further study. After extended discussion Professor Kinneman withdrew his motion.

On motion of Professor Ingraham it was *voted* to withdraw the study of the subject from Committee B and to refer it to a special committee for study.

### III. Association Policies and Procedures

*Invitation from the Trustees of T. I. A. A. Stock, Inc.* The General Secretary presented a letter from Mr. Jackson E. Reynolds, President of the Trustees of T. I. A. A. Stock, Inc., inviting the American Association of University Professors "to designate or appoint a committee to examine the condition of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, and to report to the trustees of T. I. A. A. Stock, Inc., the result of your examination."

Following a discussion of Mr. Reynolds' letter, it was *voted* on motion of Professor Jamison that the President and the General Secretary of the Association be authorized to accept the invitation and empowered to appoint a committee to make the investigation.<sup>1</sup>

*Proposal to Create Position of Field Secretary.* Pursuant to action of the Council at its 1941 spring meeting, there was reconsidered a proposal to create a new Association position, that of Field Secretary "with headquarters in Chicago, the Field Secretary to devote his whole time to the work of organizing and visiting chapters and arranging regional programs." In the further discussion of this proposal, Professor Ward suggested as an alternative the possibility of chapter visitation by former presidents when they became emeritus professors. Professor Hill expressed disapproval of the suggestion that the Field Secretary have separate headquarters. He stated that he felt that the usefulness of such a

<sup>1</sup> Members of committee appointed pursuant to this action: Professors Mark H. Ingraham (Mathematics), University of Wisconsin, Chairman; Frederick S. Deibler (Economics), Northwestern University; and Elliott E. Cheatham (Law), Columbia University.

secretary would depend upon his knowledge of and insight into the work of the Association, which could be obtained only by studying the work of the central office. He expressed the hope that after the war the Association might be able to appoint a third person in the central office to look after the affairs of chapters.

Upon motion of Professor Ward, it was *voted* that the proposal to appoint a Field Secretary for the Association be laid on the table.

*Report of Special Committee to Study a Proposal to Establish Regional Boards for the Consideration of Complaints Concerning Faculty-Administration Relations and a Proposal that a Delegate from the Association Visit All Colleges and Universities Regularly.*

The General Secretary presented a letter from Professor Horace M. Gray, of the University of Illinois, Chairman of a Special Committee to Study a Proposal to Establish Regional Boards for the Consideration of Complaints Concerning Faculty-Administration Relations and a Proposal that a Delegate from the Association Visit All Colleges and Universities Regularly, in which Professor Gray recommended that the committee be discharged.<sup>1</sup>

Following a brief discussion of Professor Gray's recommendation, which was concurred in by Professors Ingraham and Hill, it was *voted* on motion of Professor Ward that the special committee be discharged.

*Proposal to Reduce Annual Dues of a Husband and a Wife Where Both Are Members.* There was a brief discussion of the proposal to reduce annual dues of a husband and a wife where both are members of the Association. Upon motion of Professor Bushey it was *voted* to lay the proposal on the table.

*Institutions Restored to Eligible List.* The General Secretary reported that Louisiana State Normal College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, and New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State College, New Mexico, removed from the Association's eligible list at the 1940 winter meeting of the Council because of loss of accreditation and because of evidence of unsatisfactory

<sup>1</sup> Committee created pursuant to action of the Council taken at its 1940 spring meeting. Members of committee: Professors Horace M. Gray, University of Illinois, Chairman; William M. Hepburn, University of Alabama; Victor D. Hill, Ohio University; and Mark H. Ingraham, University of Wisconsin. For discussion of proposal which led to appointment of committee, see Council Record, December, 1940 *Bulletin*, pp. 657-658.

conditions of academic freedom and tenure, had during the past year regained accreditation. He reported that the administrations in both instances had given assurance that conditions of academic freedom and tenure at these institutions were now satisfactory.

On the recommendation of the General Secretary it was *voted* to restore Louisiana State Normal College and New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts to the Association's eligible list.

*Effect of the War on the Association.* The General Secretary spoke briefly concerning the possibility of loss of membership during the war and also of the possibility of the General Secretary's and the Associate Secretary's being called into military service.

*Contribution of Chapters to Civilian Morale.* Professor Patton suggested for discussion the matter of faculty contribution to civilian morale. The consensus of the group was that chapters of the Association should concern themselves with civilian morale and that this subject could appropriately be brought to the attention of members in a Chapter Letter.

#### IV. Economic Welfare of the Profession

*New Contracts of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.* Professor Ingraham spoke briefly concerning the new contracts of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. He reviewed the principal points of his article in the December, 1941 *Bulletin* entitled, "Interest Rates, Longevity, and Retirement Annuities." He stated that, because of decreased interest rates and increased longevity, a teacher entering into a contract for retirement annuity now would receive only about half as much in benefits as one entering such a contract in 1926. This fact, he said, should be kept clearly in mind in making plans for teacher retirements and should be carefully considered by the forthcoming joint conference on the subject of retirements between representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges.

*Effect of Prolonged Leaves of Absence on Retirement Contracts.* Professor Hughes suggested for discussion the effect of prolonged

leaves of absence on retirement contracts, particularly those which provide for contributions from both the teacher and the institution. She urged that this aspect of the retirement problem should be carefully considered at the conference with representatives of the Association of American Colleges.

*Recommendations Concerning the Reorganization and the Work of Committee Z on the Economic Welfare of the Profession.* The General Secretary spoke briefly of the reorganization of Committee Z on the Economic Welfare of the Profession and of the plans previously authorized by Council action for a study by this Committee of salaries and salary schedules. He stated that, in view of present abnormal conditions due to the war, it did not seem wise for the Association to start a study of salaries and salary schedules at this time. He recommended that for the period of the war the Council act on all matters that would normally be assigned to Committee Z.

It was the sense of the meeting, determined by an informal vote, that the reorganization of Committee Z and the projected study of salaries and salary schedules be delayed until after the war.

*Group Health, Accident, and Disability Insurance.* The General Secretary presented a communication from Professor Ray C. Friesner of the faculty of Butler University concerning a study of group health, accident, and disability insurance. At the invitation of the General Secretary, Professor Alfred Manes of Indiana University spoke on the subject of group health, accident, and disability insurance.

It was the sense of the meeting that the results of the Indiana study of group health, accident, and disability insurance should be made available to the Association's Committee P on Pensions and Insurance.

*National Employment Service for Professional Personnel.* The General Secretary and the Associate Secretary reported on a recent conference which had been called by the American Council on Education in cooperation with the sponsors of the National Roster of Scientific Personnel to Study the Possibility of Establishing a National Employment Service for Professional Personnel.

## V. Educational Standards

*Personnel and Work of Committee D on Educational Standards.* The General Secretary invited the members of the Council to make suggestions concerning the personnel of Committee D on Educational Standards and the work which this Committee should undertake.

## VI. Financial

*Annual Report of Treasurer.* Professor Lewis presented the report of the Treasurer for 1941 and requested several necessary changes in the 1941 budget for the items: Telephone and Telegraph, Other Committees Field, and Stationery and Supplies.

It was *voted* to approve the Treasurer's Report and to authorize the necessary Budget changes indicated by the Treasurer.<sup>1</sup>

*Budget for 1942.* The budget for 1942 was presented by the Treasurer. President Deibler presented a recommendation from the Executive Committee that the annual travel allowance for members of the Council be increased from \$100 to \$125.

It was *voted* to approve the budget with the change concerning travel allowance for members of the Council as recommended by the Executive Committee.

*Salary of General Secretary.* Upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, presented by President Deibler, it was *voted*: (1) that the annual salary of the General Secretary, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, be increased \$400 January 1, 1942; (2) that it is the sense of the Council that Dr. Himstead's salary as General Secretary should be increased \$400 annually until a maximum annual salary of \$10,000 is reached, conditioned upon his willingness to enter into a contributory retirement annuity plan to be worked out in a form satisfactory to the Council; (3) that the 1942 budget be amended to take care of the increase in the salary of the General Secretary as provided in Section 1 of this recommendation.

*Proposed Purchase of United States Defense Savings Bonds.* The General Secretary raised the question of investing some of the

<sup>1</sup> For Treasurer's Report see February, 1942 *Bulletin*, pp. 115-117.



Association's reserve funds in United States Defense Savings Bonds.

Upon motion of Professor Kinneman, it was *voted* that the matter of investing some of the reserve funds of the Association in United States Defense Savings Bonds be left to the discretion of the General Secretary and the President with the advice of the Executive Committee if desired.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

## MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admission of Members following nomination by one Active Member of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election cannot take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

(a) *Active*. To become an Active Member, it is necessary to hold a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate Members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus*. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership. Emeritus members pay no dues but may if they desire receive the *Bulletin*, at \$1.00 a year.

(e) *Life Membership*. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active, Junior, and Associate

Members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

### Nominations for Membership

The following 173 nominations for Active membership and 5 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

#### *Active*

University of Alabama, Harry M. Campbell, Thomas N. McVay; Allegheny College, Henry S. Dyer; University of Arkansas, Isabella C. Wilson; Bates College, Paul R. Sweet; Bowling Green State University, Myrtle Jensen, Merrill C. McEwen; Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Ida K. Schmidt, Halsey Stevens, Harold Tarkow; University of California (Los Angeles), James Gilluly; Centenary College, William Schuhle, Jr.; The City College (New York), William R. Gondin, Julius A. Kuck; Coker College, Charles N. Sisson, Virgil Smith, Dwight Steere; Colgate University, Elbert W. Burr; Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Max E. Tyler; Connecticut College, William H. Carter, Jr.; University of Connecticut, William R. Clark, Neal F. Doubleday; Cornell University, Richard T. Gore; University of Delaware, Anna J. De Armond, Margaret Kellogg, David K. Spiegel; Drake University, Pearl C. Bjork, Alfred T. DeGroot; Duke University, Henry Bruinsma; Ferris Institute (College of Pharmacy), Howard Hopkins; Fordham University (Manhattan), George H. Owen; Georgia School of Technology, Graves H. Wilson; Grinnell College, James F. West; Hamilton College, Francis L. Patton; University of Hawaii, Bruce White; Illinois Institute of

**Technology**, Jesse E. Hobson, Max Jakob, Marie W. Spencer, Friedrich K. Richter, Alvin Whitehill; **Western Illinois State Teachers College**, Carl L. Nelson; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Wilbur B. Brookover; **Indiana University**, Montana L. Grinstead; **State University of Iowa**, Theodore L. Jahn, Harold H. McCarty; **Kansas State College**, Arthur B. Sperry, Verne S. Sweedlun; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Vernon T. Clover, Pearl G. Cruise, Emma B. Golden, Roy Rankin, Paul T. Scott, Leonard Thompson; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Florence G. Davis, Adeline Wipf; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Virginia McAllister; **Kent State University**, James N. Holm; **Kenyon College**, Richard G. Salomon; **Lawrence College**, Eunice W. Clark, William F. Read; **Lincoln University**, Louis E. Fry; **Lindenwood College**, Fern E. Staggs; **Louisiana State University**, Janet Agnew, George Foster; **Madison College**, Helen M. Frank; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Margaret B. Rheinberger; **Mary Washington College**, W. Edwin Hemphill, Earl Nicks; **Michigan State College**, Richard G. Horton, Wilbur F. Luick, J. A. Strelzoff; **University of Michigan**, John W. Riegel; **Mills College**, Darius Milhaud; **University of New Hampshire**, Herbert A. Carroll; **University of New Mexico**, Frank H. Jonas, Gene T. Pelsor; **New York Medical College**, Lindsley F. Cocheu, Margaret Hotchkiss, Lois Lillick, Andrea Saccone; **New York University**, Charles Haubiel, Robert M. Herbst, John M. Labberton; **North Carolina College for Negroes**, W. Edward Farrison, Lawrence Knox, William H. Robinson; **University of North Dakota**, Willard E. Davenport; **Northwestern University**, William Balamuth, Margery C. Carlson, Electa A. Gamron, Daniel R. Lang, Merhyle F. Spotts; **Occidental College**, Charles K. Alexander; **University of Oklahoma**, Samuel Silver; **University of Omaha**, Leslie Garlough, Robert W. Starring; **University of Oregon**, Wesley C. Ballaine, Frederick M. Combella, Arnold Elston, Hoyt C. Franchere, Maude Garnett, Rose E. McGrew, Sigurd Nilssen, Hugh M. Shafer; **Pennsylvania State College**, Louis J. Bradford, John Carlock, Ellwood B. Cassel, George L. Guillet, Sylvain J. Pirson, Arthur H. Reede, Leland S. Rhodes, Frederick Stewart, Lindsey W. Whitehead; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville)**, Raymond S. Hovis; **University of Pennsylvania**, William E. Arnold; **University of Pittsburgh**, Wilmer E. Baldwin, Charles R. Crow, Jr., William R. Grove, Louis W. H. Johnston, Charles W. Lomas, John W. May, Frederick P. Mayer, John W. Oliver, Edwin L. Peterson, Francis J. Putman, Hurd W. Safford, Charles P. Scott, Surain S. Sidhu, Warren W. D. Sones, J. Paul Watson; **Queens College (New York)**, Phillips Bradley, Charles F. Gosnell, Esther K. Sheldon; **University of Redlands**, Olive M. Sarber; **Princeton University**, Cyril E. Black, George A. Graham, Eugene Pacsu, Stow S. Persons, William Ringler; **San Angelo College**, Rose S. Brewer, John S. Spratt; **San Bernardino Valley Junior College**, Edna Storr; **San Francisco State College**, Ruth R. Baker; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, John E. Conner; **University of Toledo**, Densil Cooper, Arnold W. Lapp, Raymond Lavallee, Jesse R. Long, Erman O. Scott; **Tulane University**, Gerald M. Capers, Jr., Robert D. Field, Heinz Thannhauser; **Utah State Agricultural College**,

Ruth M. Bell, King Hendricks, Evan Murray, William N. Watson; **Medical College of Virginia**, Clair R. Spealman; **Virginia State College for Negroes**, Charles J. Wartman, Jr.; **Wabash College**, Byron K. Trippet; **Western Washington College of Education**, Paul R. Grim; **Wayne University**, William J. Bossenbrook, D. Clarence Morrow, Harold O. Soderquist, Jane B. Welling; **West Virginia Wesleyan College**, Lewis H. Chrisman, Arthur A. Schoolcraft; **Willamette University**, Robert E. Lantz, Robert H. Tschudy; **Winthrop College**, H. L. Frick, Gerald Langford, Crystal Theodore, Jack McL. Watson; **Yale University**, Julian J. Obermann.

### *Junior*

**University of Connecticut**, Clarence J. Miller; **Iowa State College**, Elizabeth Fautz, Alonzo M. Myser; **Princeton University**, Milford S. Loughheed; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, John C. Matthews (Ph.D., University of Virginia), Bristol, Tenn.; Jennie Sofejko (M.S., Columbia University), Cortland, N. Y.

### Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 197 Active and 7 Junior Members as follows:

### *Active*

**Adelphi College**, Marion Y. Ostrander; **University of Alabama**, Edward H. Anderson, Oscar Dahlene, Edward Foster, Arnold Powell, Jerome W. Schweitzer; **University of Arkansas (Medical School)**, Benjamin B. Wells; **Atlanta University**, Hugh Gloster; **Ball State Teachers College**, Esther J. Swenson; **Baylor University**, Merle M. McClellan; **Beloit College**, Arthur M. Coon; **Billings Polytechnic Institute**, Herbert Klindt; **Bowdoin College**, Samuel E. Kamerling; **Bowling Green State University**, Herschel Litherland; **Butler University**, J. Russell Townsend, Jr.; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Clara E. Miller; **University of Cincinnati**, George Rieveschl, Jr., Josephine Swift; **The City College (New York)**, Abraham Mazur, Sidney I. Pomerantz; **University of Colorado**, William W. Longley; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, R. Heber Richards; **University of Dayton**, Allan McL. O'Leary; **De Paul University**, Leo Shapiro; **Florida State College for Women**, Barbara Morehead; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Ethelwyn Miller; **Georgia School of Technology**, Andi Schiltz; **Green Mountain Junior College**, Clarence E. Akerstrom; **Harris Teachers College**, Gertrude J. Bishop, Helen L. Graves, Theodore H. Leon, Marie A. Moore, Sol E. Margolin, John R. Powell, Grace R. Shetterly, Elizabeth Toomey; **Hobart College**, Stuart Jamieson; **Huron College**, Noble C. Gantvoort, Ruth Koerber, Leo Spurrier; **Southern Illinois Normal University**, Frances Rowe, Jesse E. Young; **Eastern Illinois State Teachers Col-**

lege, Gertrude Hendrix; Western Illinois State Teachers College, Clifford A. Julstrom; Indiana State Teachers College, Walter E. Marks; Indiana University, Horst Frenz, Francis E. McIntyre, Frances Orgain; Iowa State College, Eugene H. Wilson; Juniata College, Kathleen Burnett; Kansas State College, Alfred T. Perkins, John C. Peterson; Fort Hays Kansas State College, David M. Cole, Donald M. Johnson; Lawrence College, Frank E. Fischer, Henry F. May, Jr., David H. Owen; Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Archie C. Thomas; Louisiana State University, James W. DeVault, Donald H. Morrison; MacMurray College for Women, Herbert Philippi; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Daniel C. Walsh; Marquette University, Paul Noelke; Mary Washington College, James H. Dodd, Richard M. Kirby; Western Maryland College, Marion R. Bartlett; University of Maryland, Millard Barton, C. A. Hogentogler, Charles A. Shreeve, Jr., J. Marvin Sipe; Memphis State College, William G. Deen; University of Michigan, Joshua McClennen; Mills College, Alfred Neumeyer; Monmouth College, Glenn E. Robinson, Robert G. Woll, Margaret Woodbridge; Mt. Holyoke College, Dana B. Durand; Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney), Gail Powell; New Jersey State Teachers College (Montclair), Howard F. Fehr; New Mexico State College, Wilbur H. Goss, Marion A. Hardman, A. M. Lukens, Oliver E. McAdams, G. William Schneider, John M. Swarthout; East Carolina Teachers College (North Carolina), Beecher Flanagan, Herbert ReBarker; Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Elisabeth Jastrow; Northwestern University, Ira O. Anderson, Royal G. Bigelow, Elizabeth Burgett, Robert L. Champion, Harold A. Graver, Richard S. Hartenberg, Harry D. Kerrigan, Wilbert Seidel; Norwich University, Ralph C. Taylor; Notre Dame College, Mary Jane Manning; Ohio University, Carl J. House, Floyd L. James, Frederic Picard; Ohio Wesleyan University, Hastings Eells, Sigfred C. Matson, Guy W. Sarvis; Eastern Oregon College of Education, Ralph E. Badgley, Edith B. Darby, Joseph Gaiser, Alvin Kaiser, Arta F. Lawrence, Albert V. Logan, John M. Miller, Betty E. Molgard, Floyd Orton, Charles Quaintance, Kenneth E. Schilling, Amanda Zabel; Pennsylvania State College, Kent Forster, Kenneth D. Hutchinson, Mary Jane Wyland; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville), Lee E. Boyer, Dean Dutcher, Justus M. Hull, Lynwood S. Lingenfelter, Sanders P. McComsey, C. Maxwell Myers, Milton Steinhauer, Mark E. Stine; University of Pennsylvania, George A. MacFarland, Ralph C. Preston; University of Pittsburgh, H. H. Green, Herbert Longenecker, Herbert Olander; Princeton University, Samuel B. Bossard, Jeremiah S. Finch, Asher E. Hinds, Robert H. Super; Queens College (New York), Robert H. Ball, Arthur L. Colwin, T. Freeman Cope, Henry David, Jacques G. C. Le Clercq, David G. Powers; University of Redlands, Earl Cranston, Alton A. Lindsey, Gerard F. W. Mulders; Reed College, Lloyd Reynolds; Russell Sage College, H. Marcelle Henry; St. Francis College, Nicholas Schanck; St. Lawrence University, George Brown, Donald Emblen, John R. Mashek, Olive Parmenter; St. Louis University, Frederic L. Jones, Herbert M. McLuhan, Marshall Smelser; San Diego State



College, John E. Firman, E. Hunter Mead; **San Francisco State College**, Ruth Lyon, Edla Walter; **Smith College**, Walter Gieseke, Jean F. Mitchell; **Sul Ross State Teachers College**, A. J. Parkhurst; **Syracuse University**, Allen P. Cowgill; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Floyd B. Clark, Arvy F. Ligon; **Southwest Texas State Teachers College**, Harold G. Burman; **University of Texas**, Gibson Danes; **Tulane University**, Anna Jane Harrison; **University of Utah**, G. Victor Beard, Henry H. Frost, Jr., Don M. Rees, Charles P. Schleicher; **University of Vermont**, Ippocrates Pappoutsakis; **Wabash College**, Lloyd B. Howell; **Washington and Jefferson College**, George W. Bennett; **Central Washington College of Education**, Paul E. Blackwood, Wayne S. Hertz; **State College of Washington**, Hilton P. Goss; **University of Washington**, Clara A. Storvick; **Wayne University**, Henry H. Pixley, Emery Troxel; **Wellesley College**, Katy B. George; **Western College**, M. D. Jeremy Ingalls; **Western Reserve University**, J. Paul Quigley; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, Jane L. Chidsey; **College of William and Mary**, Daniel J. Blocker, Wayne F. Gibbs, John R. L. Johnson, Harold R. Phalen, Bruce T. McCully, Thomas Thorne; **Williams College**, William M. Gibson, Clay Hunt, Colin C. Reid, R. Jack Smith; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Oshkosh)**, Robert G. Neumann; **Xavier University**, Alvin H. Jones.

### *Transfer from Junior to Active*

**The City College (New York)**, Alfred Levin; **Pennsylvania State College**, Evan Johnson, Jr.

### *Junior*

**Louisiana State University**, Dorothy George; **University of Missouri**, Wainwright D. Blake; **Northwestern University**, Sol Garfield, Harlan L. Hagman, Armand L. Hunter, William D. Lucas; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, Cecil Smith (M.A., Ohio State University), Pratt Kans.

### Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

The Association is glad to render service to appointing officers and teachers by publishing the information below. The officers of the Association can, however, take no responsibility for maintaining a register or for making a selection among applicants. It is optional with the appointing officer or the applicant to publish the address in the announcement or to use a key number. In the latter case those interested should send their letters of application to the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

#### *Vacancies Reported*

Mathematics: Instructor, small New England college. Prefer young man, unmarried, Ph.D. degree. Salary, \$2000. V 1104

#### *Teachers Available*

Art History: Man, 33, single, A.M., M.F.A., Princeton. 8 years of college teaching. Now employed. 5 summers of travel and study in Europe. Phi Beta Kappa. Available in September. A 2007

Bacteriology: Man, 37, married, Ph.D. 2 years in experiment station, 6 years of teaching in midwestern university. Publications. Now successfully employed. Desires change to position with greater opportunity. A 2008

Botany, Bacteriology, Biology: Has taught Zoology, Visual Education. Man, 46, married, 2 children. M.S., now completing work for Ph.D. (University of Chicago). 14 years' experience in college teaching; also high school and elementary experience. Desires position in university or college of good standing. Primary interest, teaching; secondary, research. Available June, 1942. A 2009

Chemistry: Man, 42, married, Ph.D. Over 20 years' college teaching experience, chiefly inorganic and analytical chemistry. Research, administrative and consulting experience. Publications. Available for a favorable permanent position. A 2010

Chemistry: Physical chemist, Ph.D., with teaching experience in inorganic chemistry and research in insecticides and fertilizers, publications and patents, desires teaching or research position. A 2011

Economics and Sociology: Man, 45, Ph.D., native American; 8 years' undergraduate and graduate teaching experience in 2 outstanding universities; travelled and studied abroad; executive and business experience. Publications. Desires suitable change. A 2012

Education, Religious Education, Religion: Woman, single. Ph.D., Yale University. Experience in college and university teaching and administration. Extensive speaking and lecturing engagements. Excellent references. Available September. A 2013

English: Man, 31, 3-A draft classification. M.A., Ph.D. Major fields: Renaissance, 19th-century, Shakespeare. Five years' experience, teaching composition and advanced literature courses; two years as chairman of English department. Now employed on west coast; desires position in middle-west or east. A 2030

English: Man, 31, married, A.M. Over 6 years of college teaching experience. Only dissertation to complete for Ph.D. Special interests: semantics, modern literature, literary criticism. Now teaching; available September. A 2014

English: Man, Ph.D., married. 21 years' university teaching. Nineteenth century specialization, with courses in Contemporary Literature and World Classics. Extensive foreign travel, studies abroad, research publications, and a volume of poetry. Desires change: professorship, with or without administrative responsibilities. A 2015

English: Man, 50, unmarried. 13 years of college teaching with extensive foreign residence and study. Scottish descent. A 2035

French, German, Spanish: Man, 38, single. Quebec Provincial Scholar in Europe 1928-1931. Doctorate. Extensive foreign travel. Publications. 10 years' teaching experience in college. Desires change. Available June or September. Also interested in summer employment. (Experienced violinist, can also coach tennis.) (U. S. citizen.) A 2016

Geography: Man, 35, married. Ph.D. 6 years of successful college teaching. Publications and research. Excellent recommendations. Now employed but desires more responsible position. Sigma Xi. A 2031

Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Physics: Man, 66; 34 years' experience teaching in 2 denominational colleges, plus 11 years in technical laboratories. Intimate acquaintance with Southwest area. A 2017

German: Man, 44, married, American ancestry, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Phi Beta Kappa. Study abroad. 18 years' college experience, including teaching German language and literature, scientific German, elementary Spanish, chairman of department of modern languages. Research. Publications. Desires change. A 2018

German, French, Greek, Latin, Classical Arabic, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, Comparative Philology, Comparative Literature, European History: Man, 28, married. Ph.D. in Germanic Philology. Phi Beta Kappa.

Now employed. Available September. 6 years' teaching experience at large universities. 5 years' professional experience as translator (German, French, Dutch). Publications, research in progress. Desires university or college position. Excellent recommendations. U. S. citizen by birth. A 2019

German, French, Spanish: Man, American born, single, 44. Ph.D., Johns Hopkins. Teaching and radio experience. Chess, Camera Club adviser. Extensive travel abroad. Excellent references. Available now. A 2032

German (language, literature, philology), French, Latin, Religion, European Literature, History of Civilization: Woman, Ph.D., Berlin. 6 years' teaching at a German university, 5 years as professor in American colleges. Publications. Extensive foreign travel. Best references. Available June. A 2020

Government, Political Science, Law: Man, 47, single, Harvard LL.B. and French doctorate, 11 years' teaching experience in law and government. Extensive travels and residence abroad. Publications. References. A 2021

Ancient History, Latin, Greek, Italian, European History: Man, 29; doctorate, University of Padua, Italy; M.A., University of Chicago; excellent references, full or part-time teaching. A 2022

History, European and American: Man, 51, married, admitted to Ph.D. candidacy. 28 years of college teaching experience, including 19 in present position in a teachers' college. Wishes change to college of liberal arts or university. Available after September 1. A 2023

History and Government: Man, 38, married, Ph.D. 8 years' college experience. Publications. Employed but desires change. A 2024

Home Economics: Woman, 30. M.A., Western Reserve University. Field: clothing and textiles, interior decorating and home management. 2 years' college teaching experience, 3 years' retail merchandising experience. Available September, 1942. A 2033

Journalism: Man, 39, unmarried, Ph.D. (English); 6 years' city newspaper experience, 13 years' university teaching; fields: newspaper law, history of free press, creative writing. A 2025

Spanish, French, German: Woman, 38; Ph.D., University of Vienna. 10 years' teaching experience in Europe and in the United States. Now employed as assistant professor, advanced courses in French and Spanish, language and literature. Special interests: Comparative European Literatures, German, French and Spanish to musicians, and scientific German, French, Spanish. Available June, 1942. Excellent recommendations from American scholars. A 2026

Statistics, Calculus of Probability and related subjects: Man, 50, married, Ph.D., French citizen. 20 years' teaching in leading European universities. Now employed. Numerous publications on theory and applications to biology, physics, engineering problems, economics, demography, actuarial science. Interested in research. Available October, 1942. A 2027

Visual Education, Commerce: Man, 45, married. B.S., M.A. 20 years' teaching, covering grades: high school, accredited business schools and teachers college. Penman. Directed visual program 10 years. Experience in interpreting school activities photographically in school and city publications. Extensive teaching experience in business subjects. A 2034

Zoology: Man, 38, married. Ph.D., Michigan. 12 years' college teaching, 5 in charge of vertebrate embryology, large Eastern university. Now employed in small western college. Wishes opportunity to become established in sizable institution emphasizing pre-medical subjects. Sigma Xi. A 2029

Internationally famous Violinist and Conductor: For the last 12 years, head of string and orchestral departments in an Eastern university. Wishes to make a change in the same capacity or as director of music department. Has extended experience as violin soloist and conductor of symphony and opera. A 2028

## A LOW-COST ILLUSTRATION

### 10-Year Term Insurance

Disability Waiver of Premium Included

At Age	Annual Premium Per \$1,000 Insurance	First Year Cash Dividends*
25	\$ 7.66	\$2.34
35	\$ 9.06	\$2.15
45	\$14.84	\$2.64

\* 1942 Dividend Scale. Dividends, while not guaranteed, have been paid every year.

Term Insurance fits only temporary needs. Rates and descriptions of all policies offered will be sent on request. You must take the initiative. We have no agents; the saving goes to you.

## TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

522 Fifth Avenue

New York

*Created and Endowed to Serve the Educational World*

*The*  
**BULLETIN**

**American Association  
of  
University Professors**

**A**N EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL by teachers and investigators stressing articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in or a part of our institutions of higher learning. Current subjects: place and function of faculties in college and university government; faculty-administration relations; freedom of inquiry and expression; tenure; the evaluation of faculty services; professional ethics.

Published bimonthly during the academic year: February, April, June, October, and December. Circulation 15,000.

*Subscription \$3.00 a year*

American Association of University Professors  
1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.

**Journal of Higher  
Education**

**THE MAGAZINE FOR  
LEADERS IN COLLEGIATE  
EDUCATION**

Subscription \$3 a year

**OHIO STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**COLUMBUS**

For the past twelve years the Journal has been recognized as the leading magazine devoted to matters pertaining to the different areas of higher education. The contents of each issue are varied. The prospectus for the year's issues contains discursive articles, reports of research, and criticisms of current practices. We believe that professors and administrative officers, when once subscribers to the Journal, will find it so satisfying that they will not wish to be without it.



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

### **The Literature of Junior College Terminal Education**

By LOIS E. ENGLEMAN and WALTER C. EELLS. Contains more than 1,500 abstracts of articles, bulletins, and theses. Carefully classified and fully indexed. 336 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

### **Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education**

By WALTER C. EELLS, BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD, EDWARD F. MASON and MAX SCHIFERL. Summary of nation-wide investigation on the status of terminal education in more than 400 junior colleges. Copiously illustrated. 350 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

### **Why Junior College Terminal Education?**

By WALTER C. EELLS, JOHN W. HARBESON, EDWARD F. MASON, NICHOLAS RICCIARDI, WILLIAM H. SNYDER, and GEORGE F. ZOOK. An analysis of vital economic, social, and educational factors and summary of judgments of almost 2,000 educators and laymen. 390 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

### **Accreditation Requirements for Junior Colleges**

Chart showing in compact form essentials of accreditation requirements for junior colleges as formulated by 38 national, regional, and state agencies. Size 24" x 38". \$0.50 per copy.

### **Junior College Journal**

Only national periodical devoted exclusively to the rapidly expanding junior-college field. Nine issues, September to May. \$3.00 per year.

*Complete list of publications on request*

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES**  
730 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

## OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

**Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges**, edited by Guy E. Snively. Issued four times a year. \$3.00.

**American Education and World Responsibility—The Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting, 1942.** Addresses by Malcolm MacDonald, H. W. Prentiss, Jr., George N. Shuster. Additional articles by Paul V. McNutt, Isaiah Bowman and Guy E. Snively. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (*Bulletin*, March, 1942.) \$1.50.

**The American Colleges and the Social Order** by Robert Lincoln Kelly. An interpretative and critical study of the development of American colleges and college education which gives new perspective to the much discussed problems of higher education today. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

**Teaching with Books—A Study of College Libraries** by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, New York, and American Library Association, Chicago. \$2.50.

**Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities** by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art. Single copy, \$1.25; ten copies, \$10.00.

**Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges** by Edward Safford Jones. 434 pages. \$2.50.

**College Music** by Randall Thompson. Report of an investigation of non-professional offerings in typical selected institutions under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the  
**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES**  
19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.